

# The Rambler,

A CATHOLIC JOURNAL AND REVIEW.

---

VOL. XI.

JUNE 1853.

PART LXVI.

---

## CHARITABLE TRUSTS, ANCIENT AND MODERN.

### CATHOLIC TRUSTS SINCE THE REFORMATION.

WE come now to the last and most interesting division of our subject—the history of Catholic trusts from the Reformation to the present time. We might say their *secret* history; for they have been, ever since that era of spoliation, necessarily, more or less, kept secret. As soon as they ceased to be legal, they were, of course, covert and concealed; and there is clear evidence, from the very first, of the rise and origin of these secret and sacred trusts for keeping up the Catholic faith in this realm. Thus, in the reign of Elizabeth there was a conveyance by one recusant to another in trust, to employ the profits “to the relief of poor people at his discretion, according to the intent of the donor:” as to which it was held by a court of law to be apparent “that the donor and donee being recusants, the intent could only be the relief of poor recusants, which is not agreeable to law.” And in another case, in the reign of James I., a recusant made a gift of land to divers others, “in the hope that they would apply the profits to the use of poor scholars in Oxford or Cambridge, or elsewhere, being such as studied divinity and took orders,” which the courts construed to mean Popish priests. It is sufficiently clear that the courts were perfectly correct in their conclusions, and that these are the earliest instances of the secret trusts whereby the old faith was kept up in those dark times. In the same reign occurs a curious passage in one of Lord Coke’s Reports, revealing another of the pious devices by which Catholic trusts were sought to be concealed: “Resolved, that if a man devise to any of his kindred to superstitious uses, although he directed them only to pay certain sums to those uses, no other consideration shall be supposed but that which they in those times thought to be the service of God;” that is to say, it shall not be presumed that the intention was to benefit the kindred, though this was professed to be partly the purpose of the testator, but that his real object was the

“superstitious use.” And the judges go on to say: “This was the most worthy consideration for which the devise was made to friends; more trust was imposed in them than in others, therefore were they picked out.” It is singular that the same species of reasoning is employed by the judges after the Revolution in construing the atrocious “Popery acts” of William III., prohibiting Catholics from holding lands. In the great case of *Roper v. Ratcliffe*, which went to the House of Lords, we find the judges arguing thus: “Wives, daughters, sisters, cousins, and other dear friends are within the act; for if men put confidence in their kindred and friends for temporal goods, how much more, when they intended to dispose of their temporal possessions for the good of their souls (as was then thought), they would convey them to those in whom they had the greatest confidence; and in these cases of divine service concerning the health of the soul, it shall not be understood as for the advancement of testator’s family or any earthly considerations, but all shall be intended for the continuance of the divine services, as things, without all comparison, most worthy and excellent: and he who betrays such trust is a greater offender than he who doth not perform trust or confidence concerning temporal things.” This was in the reign of George I.; and it is obvious that the system of secret spiritual trusts had been carried down from the era of the Reformation, and still continued. We cannot better describe their origin than in the pathetic language of the pious founder of one such trust, which was created at this very period and still continues. In 1719, a Mr. Stephenson conveyed certain land absolutely to a Mr. Thornbergh, leaving a letter behind him at his death directed to that gentleman, in which he thus wrote: “Because in these evil times we cannot, without hazard of trouble and seizures, leave any alms to pious uses by express deeds or declarations; nevertheless such religious legacies are beneficial to our souls, a charitable help to salvation, and a necessary relief to poor Catholics, and a support to the ministers of God’s Church, and therefore not to be omitted, but to be contrived with all possible secrecy, even from our trustees themselves till convenient time, lest by inquiries and oaths they may be obliged to forced disclosures;—for these reasons I did not express my intentions to you, but have left this letter to declare my purposes and legacies, depending entirely on your known friendship and honesty that you will cause them to be observed and performed. I do therefore declare it is my will, that the lands, &c. be applied to the maintenance of a priest of the secular clergy of Douay College to assist the poor Catholics in the parish of Kendal; and I require of you and your heirs and



assigns, and all others holding from you, that, with all due regard to honour, conscience, and our holy religion, you shall perpetuate these uses in the safest manner. This is the trust reposed in you with much confidence, and recommended to you and your posterity and assigns in the name of God."

There were, however, trusts more secret, more purely spiritual than such as this was. Some years ago, a witness before a committee of the House of Commons stated that the laws against the Catholic religion, or the law against charitable bequests, passed in the reign of George II., were evaded systematically by the donations or devises being made to the bishop or some other person who knew very well that it was meant for charitable purposes, though the intention to make the gift was never perhaps communicated to him by the donor or testator, and though there was no express trust. The witness (a Protestant) added: "Traditionally among themselves, the Roman Catholics know it ought to be devoted to the maintenance of the priests, or some purpose of that kind. These trusts have a religious sanction on them, among a body of religionists where that sanction operates very strongly; and I do not think you would often find a man (even though his moral character was not very good) belonging to the Roman Catholic body who would violate a trust of that sort." Another witness (Mr. Gibson, a Catholic solicitor in extensive practice at Manchester) stated: "I have in my experience found that parties desirous to leave property to Catholic charities leave it absolutely to clergymen of the Church of Rome, relying on their integrity and honour to apply it to charitable purposes; thus leaving it entirely to their discretion as to what particular purposes to apply it to, they being perfectly ignorant of the donor's intentions. I am satisfied that those clergymen who have these trusts imposed on them act most honourably and honestly, and devote every farthing of the money to charitable purposes." He adds: "The laity do not interfere with funds known to be under the control of the clergy without express trusts; we know that there may be secret trusts existing, which if brought to light might upset the bequests. As to funds about which no dispute can arise, and which are held under express trusts, the clergy do not conceal any thing from the laity." Here we have clearly pointed out the reason of the secrecy of these Catholic trusts, the history of which we have thus shortly but sufficiently traced from the reign of Elizabeth to the reign of Victoria, and the secrecy of which is still in many cases necessary. Another witness stated: "If I wanted to leave a sum to a chapel or college, I would leave it to a priest, who would not fail to hand it over." And another,

very hostile to the clergy, Mr. Eastwood, the hero of the Brindle-will case, said, speaking of this very property, "I believe the bishops would compel him to apply it to the purposes intended," *i. e.* religious purposes.

This brings us to the next head of our article, which is—after having shewn the existence of these secret Catholic trusts from the era of the Reformation—to inquire into their administration. It is obvious that the result of the Reformation was simply to deprive them of the protection of the secular law. That was all. This placed them in precisely the position they occupied before the secular law enforced these spiritual trusts; that is to say, they were left exclusively under spiritual, *i. e.* episcopal control. In our first article on the subject\* we shewed, that from the origin of Christianity the bishops were always considered the sole supreme arbiters of the administration of charitable trusts. We shewed that on the foundation of the Catholic Church in this country, Pope Gregory, in his instructions to St. Augustine, the Apostle of England, upheld the same principle of exclusive episcopal control as laid down in the apostolical constitutions. From the Saxon laws it will be seen, that when the state recognised the Catholic Church, and made it an established Church, the only consequence was, that the secular law enforced the decrees of the spiritual tribunals. We have shewn that up to the Reformation the administration of all religious or charitable trusts was exclusively under episcopal control. At the Reformation the law could only take away what it had given, its own recognition and protection. It no longer protected and enforced, but prohibited and proscribed Catholic trusts. It could not, however, by the law of nature and the law of God, deprive men of the right to apply their property to religious purposes according to their conscience, nor interfere with that obligation to obey episcopal control which the consciences of Catholics could not but recognise and acknowledge. The change in the law left all the obligations of conscience just where they were; and conscience would at once dictate the duty of providing for religion and charity, and the duty of obeying episcopal direction in the administration of property devoted to such purposes. Of course we do not mean that it was out of the power of testators or donors to devise their property for specific objects of charity, or to entrust its administration to the discretion of any persons they could place confidence in, laymen or clergymen; but that according to the law of the Church Catholic, which was not affected by any change of the law secular, the supreme administration and ulti-

\* See *Rambler* for April.



mate authority was reposed in episcopal hands; and the bishops, when questions arose for decision, or where room was left for the exercise of discretion, enjoyed of right a general control. Such a control had been theirs long before the state established the Church; what the state had never given, it could not take away. The law no longer enforced their jurisdiction; on the contrary, it ignored their existence: but as no Catholic could acknowledge any force in the law to deprive them of their spiritual power or functions, so neither could any Catholic acknowledge any force in the law to affect their exercise of an authority incidental to their episcopal office, and attached to it from the foundation of the Church. Practically, the matter was purely one of conscience. It had been so in the days of Ethelred; it was so again in the days of Elizabeth.

There would be, of course, a natural and necessary distinction between the two great classes of trusts we have mentioned in our cursory sketch of their history,—express trusts and secret trusts; or rather (to distinguish more truly) spiritual trusts; for express trusts might be secret, and the trusts loosely called secret were not necessarily so: they were in reality, in a legal sense, not trusts at all, whether secret or not, since they were simple and absolute donations or bequests, without any trust obligatory upon the receiver and requiring any particular application of the property. This species of trust was recognised by the law in the earlier times. Our oracles of the common law, from Bracton to Littleton, *i.e.* from the reign of Henry III. to the reign of Henry VI., lay it down, that when property was simply given to a bishop or an abbot, and his successors, they took absolutely (in their ecclesiastical character of course), and there was no trust of which the law took cognisance, but a duty over which the spiritual superiors alone had exclusive control; though where the property was specifically given for certain particular purposes, the law would, supposing those purposes lawful—as masses for the dead, for instance, were at common law, and as all Catholic purposes *except* masses for the dead are now,—create a legal trust enforceable in the “Courts of Conscience,” or, as we must now say, the “Court of Chancery.” The result of this distinction would be, that where property was left absolutely and simply to any person, layman or clergyman, and the receiver in conscience was compelled to acknowledge the donor’s intention was that it should be applied to religious purposes, the bishop would have a general power of disposition; but that with respect to express trusts, the bishop would be bound to follow the directions of the testator so far as it was possible or reasonable, preserving still



that general control which would involve a power of commutation or variation, should such be really necessary in order to adapt an endowment to the altered circumstances of modern times. In treating of the Protestant administration of trusts in our last article, we shewed the absurdities which constantly resulted from an absence of such a power of variation, commutation, and control, and from the hard and literal way of construing trusts which necessarily prevails in a secular tribunal, or at least has always prevailed in our Court of Chancery since it became a secular tribunal. Under such a system, if an endowment were for a school, or chapel, or divine service in a particular place, and the income either so augmented as to be immeasurably superfluous for that purpose, or on the other hand the school or congregation in the particular locality became so diminished as to produce the same disproportion between the endowment and the object, and other districts were very much in want of some assistance for schools or chapels, the funds could not be applied to such districts as long as a single scholar or a solitary worshipper remained in the original seat of the endowment. No doubt, to every extent consistent with reason and good sense, the intentions of the testator ought to be observed, and the canon law is extremely strict upon this point; but it is especially true as to the construction of trusts, that "the letter killeth, and the spirit giveth life." There could not be conceived a more refined species of hypocrisy than that which, under the pretence of performing strictly and literally the intentions of the testator, should virtually defeat and frustrate his pious purpose and his paramount object. The hypocrisy of this is proved by the fact, that, whether in ancient or modern times, those who have stickled for this strictness in the construction of spiritual trusts have been the most unscrupulous in their spoliation of them. Curiously enough, this is exemplified in the very earliest instance extant in our law of any interference by the secular law in respect to such trusts. The law never interposed to administer, but only to confiscate and spoliolate. Thus, when the Norman dynasty was established, a statute passed (of Edward I.) enacting that if any land should be given to find a chaplain or a mass or a light in a church, and the services should cease for two years (*i. e.* in that particular church), the land should revert to the heirs of the donor. That is to say, if, a century after the endowment, circumstances rendered the particular church inconvenient for the services, and in the discretion of the bishop they were best performed elsewhere, the secular law confiscated the property, under the pretence of zeal for the intention of the testator!

If the law had been dictated by any sincere desire for that end, it could have directed its power to compel the precise performance of the trust, whereas it proceeded by way of confiscation: yet, when it suited their purpose, the lawyers could see and could say, as it was said by a court of law in the reign of Henry IV., "Divine service is a spiritual thing, and can be performed as well in one chapel as another."\*

We need scarcely remind our readers that it was under the pretence of repressing abuses of spiritual trusts, that the iniquitous spoliations of the Reformation were perpetrated. Nor need we do more than recal to their remembrance that the result of that awful revolution was really to erect the royal supremacy, and the secular power of which it is the impersonation, in the place of the episcopal authority, and that spiritual power of which it is the embodiment. Nor need we labour to shew, that though in its ultimate development the claim of the royal supremacy is necessarily rejected by all Catholics, yet that the subtle spirit of it could scarcely fail to infect and infuse itself into the minds of English Catholics, so long living among heretical fellow-countrymen, under the pressure of penal laws. The fruits of this infection and infusion are not unfrequently to be detected in the tone and temper of certain English Catholics at this day respecting the authority of the bishops in the administration of spiritual or charitable trusts. They insensibly fall into the habit of regarding every thing relating to property as out of the episcopal authority; just as their ancestors of the age of the statutes of *præmunire* were seduced into imagining that with the temporalities of religious endowments the Holy See could not interfere; a theory of which the hypocrisy and iniquity are as obvious as its inconsistency with the principles and practice of the apostolic age, or the regulations of our own early Anglo-Saxon Church. Nor is this all; in some instances they have even seemed to adopt another principle of Protestantism, the practical result of which has been to deny the bishops the exercise of their proper pastoral functions. In the Catholic system, the bishop is the supreme and primary pastor of his diocese; and necessarily, by virtue of the very nature of his office, has supreme paramount control over every thing relating to pastorship. But those Catholics who discarded the obligations imposed on conscience by the ancient and undoubted Catholic system, have maintained that wherever any emoluments were annexed to a mission (or, to use hierarchical language, a cure or parish), the pastorship was a valuable temporal right, *i. e.* of temporal value, and

\* Year Book, 2 Henry IV. Mich. Term, 25.



therefore not of spiritual cognisance; but that the heir of the founder or donor of the endowment (to use again hierarchical or legal language), the patron, and not the bishop, was entitled to present to the endowment; and that further, as this entitled the priest to a temporal right of temporal value, the bishop could not deprive him of it, except for such crimes as absolutely merited suspension, and that disobedience to the bishop's directions as to the appointment in question did not constitute such an offence. It is, of course, palpable that virtually this came to the claim of irremovability in any case of an endowment; *i. e.* it amounted to this, that the effect of an endowment was to remove a mission from the bishop's control. It amounted, however, to more, to much more. It was a virtual denial of the episcopal authority, and depriving him of his pastoral power. For many reasons it might happen that the pastorship of a mission would be best entrusted to another priest, and that the flock might be injured by his continuance. Practically, however, the bishop was deprived of any discretion, wherever there was an endowment, by means of this Protestant doctrine,—the precise doctrine of the statutes of *præmunire*, those precursors of the Reformation,—the doctrine that the temporality annexed to the spirituality was the principal, and the spiritual the accessory; whereas the law of the Catholic Church and the ancient law of England held directly the contrary, that the spiritual was the principal, and the temporal the accessory. And Bracton lays it down, that the forum follows the nature of the principal, not of the accessory; and that spiritual courts have cognisance, therefore, not only of spiritualities, but temporalities annexed to spiritualities. And surely it must be obvious that in spiritual trusts, such as those we are speaking of, the primary object of the trust is spiritual, viz. the dispensation of the spiritual ministrations intended by the founder; and the temporal emoluments must be auxiliary and subordinate, purely incidental to the spiritual right which is the principal. The instant, therefore, that a priest loses the spiritual right to carry on a mission, he loses the temporal right to receive the emolument; because the purpose of the trust is not the receipt of the income, but the spiritual provision; and he who is not in a position to dispense that, cannot execute the primary object of the trust, and so is not entitled to its incident, the emolument. This surely is self-evident upon any rational principles, legal, equitable, or theological; nay, the reasonableness of it is, to a great extent, recognised and acted upon in the Court of Chancery. It has been laid down by Lord Eldon, that “the primary object of endowments was to have the service performed;”



and the act of William IV., commonly called O'Connell's Act, legalising the holding of property for the purposes of the Catholic religion, provided that endowments for such purposes shall be placed in the same position as those of Protestant Dissenters. Lord Eldon also laid it down, that the peculiar rules of Dissenting communities would be regarded in adjudicating on the rights of parties to endowments; and that where there was doubt as to their discipline, the court would follow by analogy the practice of the Church of England. There never can be doubt as to the discipline of the Catholic Church, there being a final and supreme authority for its decision; and the Court of Chancery will enforce it in any case brought before it.

But no case can be safely brought before it where the title to the trust property is insecure, as the defect of title would be disclosed and destroy the trust. Hence it must be a necessary part of any bill for the better administration of charitable trusts, that the existing trusts should be relieved from the operation of the statute of George II., and the future ones from the operation of the statute of Superstitious Uses, which prevents enrolment in many cases under the other act. And these provisions were introduced into the bill of Sir John Romilly in 1847. Without such provision, any measure must be one of confiscation, and not of administration. A curious illustration of the difficulty Catholic trusts must encounter in Chancery, occurs in a case which was the first that came before the court after the passing of O'Connell's Act; the "leading case," as lawyers call it, on the subject. The bequests were partly to chapels, and partly to priests for masses. The counsel for the relatives, who desired to confiscate the bequests, was Mr. Bickersteth, the late Lord Langdale; and he argued thus: "The object of the testator was to make proselytes, and to promote the spread of the Roman Catholic religion. Then that is a trust which cannot be carried into execution by this court; for if it could, what would be the consequence? The court must refer it to the Master, to approve of a scheme whereby the Roman Catholic religion may be promoted in the most effectual manner." This plainly appeared to the learned counsel a *reductio ad absurdum*, and to a "good anti-Popery man" it really would look like one. The Chancellor, however, negatived this view, and declared that trust legal. Mr. Bickersteth had admitted that a bequest for the purpose of maintaining a Roman Catholic church or school would be a good charitable trust; of course the consequence followed in these cases which he had deprecated, viz. that it would be "referred to the Master" to devise the best scheme for pro-

moting the spread of the Catholic faith, and for providing for the support of the Catholic worship. Some of our readers may doubt how far a Protestant Master in Chancery (acting under a Vice-Chancellor like Sir Page Wood) would be likely to make a good arbiter in such matters. So it is, however. It is true Masters in Chancery have been abolished, but substantially the same system continues; for the matters before referred to the Master are now referred to the chief clerks of the Vice-Chancellors, *i. e.* Sir P. Wood or Sir John Romilly. The latter learned judge is a liberal and enlightened man, as the bill he introduced on this subject (to which we have already referred) sufficiently shews, for it contained clauses relieving Catholic trusts from the statute of Superstitious Uses. What an injurious effect that statute has upon those trusts can be shewn from the very case just cited, in which the Master of the Rolls held some gifts void, because mixed up (in his opinion) with superstitious uses. This is the mischief, that so many Catholic trusts for chapels or schools are "mixed up" with those "superstitious uses;" and in such cases the court is a hostile tribunal, and it is vain to talk of referring Catholic trusts to its adjudication until this fatal defect of title is settled; it is equally vain to think of any charitable trusts act as likely to be of any benefit to Catholic trusts, which does not relieve them from this difficulty.

While we are adverting to the Court of Chancery, we may as well notice what would be the course taken upon its rules as to the administration of trusts according to the intention of the donor. This was exemplified in a simple case, which we will cite as an illustration. A grammar-school was founded at Market Bosworth; it appeared that it would be for the benefit of the inhabitants that the scheme of education should be extended beyond the purposes of a grammar-school; so it was referred to the Master to settle a scheme of more general instruction. He did so, and reported that there was still a surplus of 500*l.* a year; whereupon there was a fresh reference to Chancery to know what to do with it. The Master of the Rolls said: "This Court has full jurisdiction to extend the application of the income of charity-property beyond the mere literally expressed intention of the testator, provided the income be applied to subjects connected with that intention. In this case let it be referred to the Master to consider of a further scheme for the application of the income, having regard to the testator's will, the former scheme, and other subjects connected with that scheme;" that is to say, connected with the same town. It is rarely, if ever, that a trust for a particular place is extended beyond it; and the reason of this is



obvious. There is no power in the Court analogous to that reposed in the episcopate, of marshalling the resources of a diocese or a district, and bringing them to bear upon the most distressed portions. Nor do we say that the canon law allows so large a power of discretion; on the contrary, the canon law is very strict in the construction of trusts according to the donor's intention. But then it is important to observe that the canon law only applies where there is a regular hierarchy, and indeed never existed until there was a Church established and endowed; and its whole scope and character, therefore, naturally relate rather to an endowed hierarchy than to a missionary country. And this should be considered not only in estimating the importance of a power of episcopal commutation, but also perhaps in judging of the intentions of testators. Assuming a testator to have died a good Catholic (which one may of course naturally assume from the fact of the donation), his intention might fairly be understood to be to leave a larger discretion to a missionary episcopate than under a regular and endowed hierarchy; and he could scarcely be supposed to contemplate a strict application of the rules of canon law in the construction of his trust, knowing that in point of fact it did not exist in the country. We do not say this from any desire to undervalue or depreciate the importance of a faithful administration of trusts according to the expressed intentions of the founder; but we say it for the purpose of promoting a charitable and candid consideration of the conduct of the Catholic episcopate in this country with reference to charitable trusts during the dreary period which elapsed from the Revolution to the Reform Bill, when Catholic trusts were illegal, when therefore all about them was carried on under all the embarrassments of illegality and consequent secrecy, and when this was merely a missionary country, so that the Catholic trusts had none of the protection of the secular law on the one hand, nor of the canon law on the other. To apply to an administration of trusts executed under such a system the strict rules of canon law or of the Court of Chancery, would often entail ruin and confiscation upon innocent individuals. Let us start fair (so to speak) with the regular establishment of canon law under our restored hierarchy, and concurrently with that let us have a good charitable trusts bill (if we can get it), making equitable provision for a domestic arbitration of past administration of Catholic trusts, and relieving them from all measures of penal legislation for the future.

But further, practically the Court of Chancery cannot be prudently resorted to by any charity except a very large one, on account of the costliness and cumbrousness of its proce-



ture ; characteristics which still to a great degree continue to attach to it, notwithstanding the undoubted advantages of recent reforms. And then arises the question as to the nature of the tribunal or forum to be established. Now here, as on other points, the analogy of the act of Elizabeth surely may be appealed to. That analogy has already been sanctioned in some degree by the present Master of the Rolls in his bill of 1847, for he so far imitated it in its healing and medicinal properties as to relieve existing trusts from the operation of hostile laws. It will be remembered that one great characteristic of the act of Elizabeth was, that for the purpose of facilitating recourse to its jurisdiction, the commissioners under it had power to establish any trust-title upon any disposition of property, however invalid by law, provided that there was a disposing power in the founder or donor, and an intention to make the disposition. We contend that this principle ought to be adopted in any charitable trusts bill, for the future as well as for the past, so as to give charities confidence and encouragement to disclosure. And again, we contend that the analogy ought to be adhered to also as to the constitution of the tribunal. Under the act of Elizabeth, for Protestant charities the first and principal commissioners were the Protestant bishop and his chancellor. By the law we are told the Catholic and Protestant religions are placed upon a perfect equality. Then clearly, in any commissions for Catholic charities, the bishop and his vicar-general ought to be principal and primary members. And further, as no Catholics were to be upon the commission for Protestant charities, so neither should there be Protestants upon any commission for Catholic charities. The principle has been so far sanctioned by the legislature, that in the Irish Charitable Bequests Act of 1844, the commission is to consist of certain persons, including Catholic prelates ; and questions relating to Catholic doctrine or discipline are to be decided by reference to Catholic sub-committees of the commissioners : still the principle is violated by the general and final decision being reserved to a mixed tribunal of Protestants and Catholics. What have Protestants to do with Catholic property at all ?

Nor is this all. Any such measure must be unjust, unless it establish as a principle an adherence to the *Catholic* "doctrine and discipline" as to the administration of religious trusts ; for instance, as to episcopal control and the power of commutation of trusts. The adoption of this principle is the more plainly just, because it was the ancient principle of the law of England, of which the traces can in some degree be recognised to this day. To adopt a contrary principle would

be to administer Catholic trusts on Protestant principles, which would be absurd. Moreover, it would be contrary to all analogy; for the Catholic community ought, like any other community, to have its by-laws or internal discipline, as the Dissenters have; and we have seen that episcopal control over religious trusts is of the essence of the Catholic system. Such are the general principles of any just measure for the administration of charitable trusts, so far as the Catholics are concerned. Successive governments have introduced various measures for the purpose, of which it is enough to say that they all, more or less, were opposed to these principles, and were of course opposed by the bishops. The worst was that of last session, happily defeated. The best was that of 1847, brought in by Sir J. Romilly. A better bill was drawn up, we believe under the auspices of the bishops, by Mr. Bagshawe, a Catholic chancery barrister of eminence, who has known how to combine legal learning with a religious spirit. But its success was prevented mainly by the mischievous agency and misdirected energy of Mr. Anstey; an injury to the Catholic body which for many generations probably it will have to lament.

The present government have brought in a bill upon the subject to which we adverted in our last Number, and to which we now think we scarcely did justice. We then derived our idea of it from a statement (necessarily short and imperfect) made by Lord John Russell in his speech upon education. We have since seen the bill itself, and are bound to say that it contains valuable provisions for the redress of abuses without recourse to litigation. Still it is open to all our arguments against secular administration of charitable trusts, and against superseding instead of adapting the excellent act of Elizabeth, under which charitable commissions could be issued to the Protestant bishop of each diocese and his chancellor, with eight other "proper and discreet persons," empowering them to inquire into and adjudicate upon all Protestant charities; and under an adaptation of which similar commissions could issue to the Catholic bishop of every diocese and his vicar-general, and eight other Catholics, clerical or lay, to inquire into and administer Catholic charities. This alone would be a meet and just measure; and any thing short of that must be imperfect and unjust. It is to be observed, however, that the measure now proposed only relates to legal charitable trusts, *i.e.* trusts legal, as distinguished from spiritual. And the trusts must relate to a legal charity, which is thus defined: "every endowed foundation or institution coming within the meaning or provision of the act of Elizabeth, or as to the



administration of which the Court of Chancery has jurisdiction;" which includes trusts for cathedrals, chapels, colleges or schools, since they were rendered legal by O'Connell's Act in 1832, and so the Court of Chancery recognises them, and has jurisdiction over their administration. It is provided by the bill that a Charity Board shall be appointed by the Crown, all of whom may be Protestants, as also all the inspectors they appoint; but the trustees of Catholic charities are to be Catholics. And it expressly provides that no litigation can take place without the approval of the board; that the board may settle disputes virtually by their own advice, for the following of which parties are to be indemnified; and that they shall not have power under the act to require disclosures from parties claiming to hold property free from any charitable trust, *i.e.* any legal trust. If we are right in this construction of the act, it may do good and cannot do harm; and in these days probably that is as much as we can hope for. Any how, we cannot regret the labour we have taken to contribute somewhat towards the information of our fellow-Catholics as to the sound principles of this very important subject.

---

#### EMIGRATION CONSIDERED WITH REFERENCE TO ITS INFLUENCE ON THE SPREAD OF CATHOLICITY.

OF the great colonising movement, which may be said to be the distinguishing phenomenon of the present day, and which appears to mark a new epoch in the world's history, we have, in all probability, as yet only witnessed the commencement. Australia, Algeria, India, Southern Africa, and the boundless prairies and primeval forests of America, are only beginning to emerge from the darkness which has overshadowed an unknown world. Their agricultural capabilities, their vast mineral wealth, their adaptation for commercial purposes, their importance as respects the mutual relations of the old European powers, and the sustenance and advancement of the high degree of civilisation already attained by the mother countries which have undertaken the task of colonisation, are every day becoming more and more developed. To statesmen and philosophers a new page has been opened. They are beginning to perceive that their duties and speculations are no longer to be limited within the old boundaries; that their whole mission does not consist in tiding over a difficulty, or compos-



ing a parliamentary squabble; that the feverish stir in the old communities is irrepressible, and must be directed with an enlarged vision and a prudent forethought.

The period at which it becomes necessary for the well-being of the state to open the safety-valve of emigration is not the same in all countries. It may be delayed by a prudent legislation, or accelerated by tyranny, corruption, and class-legislation. It depends much also upon national character; that mysterious power which vindicates the great moral law of retribution, by becoming so often, after centuries have elapsed, a scourge to the descendants of those who have moulded it into what it is. But, sooner or later, emigration, if not used in time as a means of prevention, must be the *ultima ratio* for redressing the unjust balance, for restoring the proportion between population and the means of subsistence, and for removing those evils which are the natural fruit of advanced civilisation, and which clog all social and moral progress.

The removal of a surplus population from their ancient homes to new and comparatively uncivilised countries deserves, however, a deeper consideration than that which merely refers to the advantage which emigrating states derive immediately from such a movement. It must be so guided, so systematised, as to prevent as much as possible the recurrence of those evils at home which have rendered it necessary, to lay the foundation of great and good communities, and, lastly, to secure the spiritual advancement of mankind. It must be, not an irregular and fortuitous emigration, but a wise, beneficent, and Christian colonisation. Such should be the first object of legislative care. Such, unfortunately, has not been the tendency during late years of England's colonial policy. She founded penal colonies, as though she expected that the concentration of her vice could prove the germ of a great people; and when the energy or the misery of individuals sent them forth from her shores, she let them go without guides, without assistance, and without system. Of course it is not to be expected that Protestant England should, by any direct legislation, encourage the spread of Catholicity in her colonies; but she might at least have provided with a parental solicitude for the social well-being and the morality of those who were flesh of her flesh and bone of her bone; and it was her bounden duty so to do. If she had done so; if, by a timely beneficence, she had sustained the patriotism of her colonists; if she had cherished family ties; if she had not permitted, with a fatal blindness, that, during the voyage out, misery and degradation and temptation should be heaped upon the suffering and weak, destroying their moral and physical energy when most required,

and rendering them incapable of exertion for self-support; if she had watched over their social interests in the new country, we will not say with that gratitude which they deserved, but with that gratitude which has been defined as a sense of favours to come,—then, indeed, she would have left the soil in a state fit to receive the good seed; and Catholics would have asked no more, except full liberty to organise both at home and abroad their missionary system.

The misconduct of the legislature has produced the results which might have been anticipated. It is unnecessary now to advert to the scandals in Australian society revealed in the Parliamentary Blue-books, redeemed though they be by the philanthropic exertions of a Mrs. Chisholm; but let us look to America. Of the vast numbers of those who have emigrated there from the British islands within the last ten years, the great bulk of whom were Irish, nine-tenths, at the lowest estimate, may be supposed to have become fixed in the United States.\* If, unfortunately, troubles were again to arise in Canada, we very much doubt whether there would be found amongst the Irish settlers there that attachment to the British connexion which saved the province during the late rebellion. But what are the dispositions towards England of those who have settled in the States? surely not those of gratitude or affection. Supposing we were to concede, what we by no means are disposed to grant, that even if the British government had done for its colonists all that it was bound to do, the great proportion of emigrants would still have been attracted to the United States by the superior energy and more developed resources of that country,—yet, we would ask, is the moral condition of Irishmen there of no moment to England? Does it signify nothing to her whether that body of men who are the labourers in the dockyards, the manufactories, the canals and railways, who are rapidly becoming a large integral part of the agricultural population, who fill the ranks of the army, and who now constitute a great political power in the Union,—

\* The proportion of United States to Canadian emigrants has for many years been steadily increasing. The returns for 1852 would shew a proportion of nearly 18 to 1. The number of emigrants who sailed from the port of Liverpool to the United States and Canada in the year 1852 was 191,835, of whom only 3873 took their passage for Canada, leaving an accession of nearly 188,000 individuals to the United States. The numbers who sailed directly from Irish ports during the same year was 32,523. The total number from Liverpool and the Irish ports was therefore 224,358. Now, assuming that of the direct Irish emigration one-fourth, or 8130, remained in Canada, the relative numbers would stand thus for the year: United States, 212,355; Canada, 12,003. Of the gross number, considerably more than two-thirds were Irish. The remainder were a motley crew,—English, Scotch, Swiss, and emigrants from Central Europe. Of those even who sail to Canada, many pass on directly to join their friends in the Western States.



whether these men should or should not be bound by social ties, restrained by religion, orderly, sober, and obedient? It is England's interest that they should be so; but it was England's duty to keep them so, and that duty she has neglected. It is not too late to profit by experience. If the past cannot be retrieved, at least future evils may be averted. A new era of emigration is opening, and we hope that the state will no longer be blind to its duties, or to the policy, nay the necessity of performing them. It will remain for the Church, under the Divine guidance, to employ this mighty movement for the spread of the truth; and for all sincere Catholics, each in his own sphere, to endeavour to foster that missionary spirit, by which, in the end, the battle will be fought and won.

In tracing the history of emigration from the remotest ages since the patriarchal times, its character seems to have been threefold, according to the different epochs at which it took place. It appears to have been at first accomplished by violence, and based upon a thirst for conquest; such was the system pursued by the Greeks, the Romans, the powers of central Asia, the hordes of the North, and the Mahommedan conquerors. The second epoch was marked by an emigration partly of conquest and partly commercial; which were the characteristics of the Spanish and Portuguese settlements in America. The spirit of modern emigration may be said to be purely commercial. Yet in all three the missionary character is more or less developed. In the first, the settlers took care to bring with them, not only their household effects, but their household gods; and it was only in a few instances, in which a less civilised power established a footing amidst one more civilised, that they failed in promulgating their own religion. In emigration of the second sort, the conversion of the invaded was put forward as the excuse and origin of the war; nor can we safely conclude, from the acts of rapacity and injustice which disgraced the struggle, that this great object was not sincerely entertained. We find from the historians of the Mexican and Peruvian invasions that the conquerors omitted no endeavours to convert their opponents, and that in many remarkable instances their efforts were crowned with success. In all their greatest dangers they openly had recourse to devotional exercises. They repudiated the great advantage they might have derived from the superhuman powers attributed to them by the natives, and exposed themselves unnecessarily to the utmost peril, in order to manifest their hatred of idolatry. In the commercial emigration of the third epoch, that of the present day, the missionary spirit is still to be found; but the desire of propagating religious truth is no longer a primary object. It

is merely incidental, and belongs not to the entire body, but to individuals. It is, without doubt, a lamentable thing that, when a great nation sends forth her children, with whom, as it were with outstretched arms, to embrace the uttermost corners of the earth and draw them to her own heart, her first thought should not be for the eternal welfare both of her own and of her adopted offspring, but that she should leave it to the enthusiasm and exertions of individuals to assist the infant colony to stumble into Christianity as best it may. Yet, even herein may we not discern the watchful care of a Divine Master? England, the great colonising power of modern times, is a Protestant state, but the vast majority of her emigrants are Catholics. But, at the same time, the interests of religion are no longer dependent on the state; they must be advanced by the exertions and devotion of individuals; and therefore, the care of the Church is removed from the hands of her enemies, and entrusted to those of her own children.

We have thus received an indication of how we ought to act, what agencies we ought to employ. Our mode of operation is as clearly spread before us as our path of duty. We repeat it, we demand nothing from the state but protection to the morals and physical wants of the emigrants; such a system as will support social and family ties, and the withdrawal of all that tends to shackle missionary organisation; the care of the Church and individual devotion will accomplish the rest.

When America was discovered, and whilst its settlement was going forward, the great commercial and colonising powers were Catholics. It cannot be denied that the Church has derived important advantage from this fact; but it is a mournful retrospect to look back to the far greater amount of benefit which she *might* have attained, and which was lost because, on so many occasions, the lust of conquest and of gold obscured the love of God and of man. Conversion had been adopted as a national object, and individuals imagined that the state having undertaken that duty, had relieved them from all responsibility. They gloried in the name of 'conquestadors' rather than of the missionaries of a Christian army. The consequences were cruelty, rapacity, and injustice. Still, a foundation for better things was laid. Religion was endowed, and noble churches were founded. Holy men followed with fearless self-devotion; and although they trod upon ground red with blood, they preached the Faith successfully, and Christian nations remain their monuments. After some time, the relative position of the great European states became altered. The Catholic states ceased to colonise. With difficulty able to protect themselves, they neglected their colonies, which crum-



bled from their hold, sometimes achieving their independence, and sometimes yielding to the growing greatness of a rival power. England, taking advantage of the peculiar capabilities of her position, and the adaptation of her people to commercial pursuits, moved onward with a giant's stride. She covered the sea with her ships, founded emporiums for commerce in the remotest regions, engrossed to herself a traffic which hitherto she had been content to share, and, impelled by the restless energy of her national character, became the greatest colonising nation of the world. The troubles which distracted her at home served to increase her colonial greatness, and religious persecution then, as now, sent her people forth to seek for liberty of conscience. If England had been exclusively a Protestant country, as, during this period, she was a Protestant state, the interests of Catholicism would have been seriously endangered by the extension of her colonial empire; but such has not been the case. Incorporated with England was a country, first the sport of her ambition, next of her rapacity, lastly of her injustice, and which adhered to the true faith with unalterable constancy. The outcasts of Ireland became the Catholic colonists of a Protestant state. Throughout the colonies you may ask, "Who are those crowds kneeling before the cross? Who maintain the Catholic priest?" The answer will still be the same; "the Irish." If you demand, "Who built this temple of the faith?" the reply will be the same as is inscribed on the magnificent Catholic church at St. Catharine's in Western Canada:—

D. O. M.  
Et sub invocatione beatæ Catharinæ  
Virg. et Mart.  
Hoc fidei ac pietatis monumentum  
Erexerunt  
Hibernici in canal. Villand. laborantes,  
1844.

Nor has the beneficial influence of Irish Catholics been exercised only within the limits of the British dependencies; they have spread themselves throughout those parts of the United States which, having been originally colonies purely English, were exclusively either Protestant or heathen, but in which the vigorous growth of Catholicity is, through the influence of Irish emigrants, becoming every day more and more developed. But rapid and successful as the progress of the Church has been in the seaboard states, it is not to them that her greatest efforts have been directed. The valley of the Mississippi, containing within itself capabilities for becoming the greatest country of the world, was but a few years since a

luxuriant wilderness. Although nineteen-twentieths of this vast tract are yet untenanted, its population now exceeds ten millions. Thriving villages, nay magnificent cities rise, as it were by magic, upon the wreck of the primeval forest. Railroads and canals intersect the heretofore pathless jungles and morasses. A rank waste of vegetation is giving way to the productions of agricultural industry. Mills and factories abound; and the great river, throughout a course of more than two thousand miles, is covered by fleets of sailing and steam vessels bearing the richest freights. The energy of man is waging a war of progress against the waste of nature, and the soldiers of the peaceful army are Irish Catholics. It is to this wonderful district that the missionary efforts of the Church are most energetically directed. We quote the account given in 1848 by a Protestant eye-witness, that intelligent and accurate observer, Mr. Mackay, whose religious prejudices are strongly adverse to Catholicism. "In her operations the Church of Rome does not confine herself to the more populous portions of the valley, her devoted missionaries penetrating its remotest regions wherever a white man or an Indian is to be found. Wherever the Protestant missionary goes, he finds that he has been forestalled by his more active rival, whose coadjutors roam on their proselytising mission over vast tracts of country into which the Protestant has not yet followed him with a similar object. Catholicism is thus, by its advance-guards, who keep pace with population whithersoever it spreads, sowing broadcast the seeds of future influence. In many districts the settler finds no religious counsellor within reach but the faithful missionary of Rome, who has thus the field to himself—a field which he frequently cultivates with success. In addition to this, seminaries in connection with the Church are being founded not only in places which are now well filled with people, but in spots which careful observation has satisfied its agents will yet most teem with population. Ecclesiastical establishments, too, are being erected, which commend themselves to the people of the districts in which they are found, by the mode in which they minister to their comforts and their necessities when other means of ministering to them are wanting. The Sisters of Charity have already their establishments amid the deep recesses of the forest, prescribing to the diseased in body, and administering consolation to the troubled in spirit, long before the doctor or the minister makes his appearance in the settlement. Both at St. Louis and New Orleans some of the best seminaries for young ladies are Catholic institutions, and not a few of those who attend them become converts to the Church. But it is in the



remote and yet comparatively unpeopled districts that the probabilities of her success in this respect are greatest. She has thus, in the true spirit of worldly wisdom, left Protestantism to exhaust its energies amongst the more populous communities; and going in advance of it into the wilderness, is fast overspreading that wilderness with a net-work which will yet embrace multitudes of its future population. How can it be otherwise when, as settlements arise, they find at innumerable points the Church of Rome the only spiritual edifice in their midst?"\* This testimony is from a source at once accurate and impartial. There is abundant authority to prove the energy and success of Catholic missionary efforts in Canada also. Mrs. Jameson informs us that "one thing is most visible, certain, and undeniable, that the Roman Catholic converts (amongst the Red men) are in appearance, dress, intelligence, and general civilisation, superior to all the others." She continues: "The English Church, said one of our most intelligent Indian agents, either cannot or will not, certainly does not, sow; therefore cannot expect to reap. The Roman Catholic missions have been, of all, the most active and persevering; next to these the Methodists. The Presbyterian and English Churches have been hitherto comparatively indifferent and negligent."

We must resist the temptation of tracing the labours of Catholic missionaries throughout their vast extent. Wherever we should follow them, whether in Australia, Africa, or the most inaccessible parts of the East, we should find them characterised by the same devoted energy, and rewarded with the same success. There is an ample body of Protestant testimony which acknowledges, though reluctantly, both the one and the other, though it may not scruple to call energy bigotry, and to attribute success to causes and motives dishonouring both the converters and converted. But such an inquiry would necessarily far exceed our present limits; nor does it belong to our present purpose, which is not to boast of what has been done, but to shew how much more may yet be done by fostering the seeds of missionary progress contained in ordinary emigration.

In the first place, then, let us observe that the rapid increase of population in the New World demands a proportionate increase of clergy; nor can the required proportion be estimated at the same ratio as that which in old and settled countries should subsist between the clergy and the people. A larger number of the former are clearly necessary for securing the proper amount of ecclesiastical ministrations for a scattered than for a condensed population. However

\* *The Western World*, by Alexander Mackay, Esq., vol. iii, pp. 264, 266.

great may be the spiritual zeal of our priests, there are limits to their powers of physical exertion; and where the great extent of their cures renders it impossible to visit their remoter parishioners more frequently than once in a month, or, as often occurs even in the better settled parts of Canada, once in six months, and sometimes for much longer periods, the effects upon the religion of the flock must be most lamentable. Let us make the case our own. If we were to be deprived during such periods of all religious consolation and of all participation in the sacraments; if for so long a time the holy sacrifice of the Mass were to be denied to us; and if nothing but our early religious impressions remained to counteract the influence of temptations, what would be the effect? But if the effect upon the parent settlers be injurious, what must it not be upon their children? The parents are generally poor, and often ignorant; they are utterly unable to impart to their families the religious education for which the young must depend almost entirely upon them. Even if they were able, their mode of life, calling forth to the utmost their physical exertions to secure a precarious existence, would unfit them for the office of Christian instructors. They, indeed, have had the advantage of an early religious training; they have left the old country when of full age; their religion has become to them not only a matter of conviction, but a matter of habit; it has grown with their growth, and is sanctified and strengthened by old and dear associations. But their children, born in the wilderness, have never been taught the first principles of the religion they profess; how can they understand it, or reverence it, or love it? Even at home, with our clergy at our doors, how imperfect is the religious training of the young! how much remains to be imparted in riper years! How often, too, does it happen that the lessons of early virtue are obscured in after-life! Then, again, the faithful priest is at hand; he brings to the repentant sinner the sacraments of reconciliation. It is not so with the children of our exiles. Uninstructed from the first, unaided, and unreprieved, they have nothing to quell their increasing pride, nothing to check their growing passions. The sin committed is unrepented; an indistinct natural consciousness alone informs them that it was a sin. They have seen the young grow up without baptism, and the old die unshriven. They have perhaps heard of a Church, but they see it not; it does not teach them; it has no voice, no ear, no sacraments; it has for them no real existence; they cannot be said to believe in it. If they attempt to reason, the workings of sinful pride and of their heated imagination plunge them deeper and deeper in the mire of



infidelity. As they grow up, carelessness sinks into unbelief; and in the next census these unhappy victims write themselves down, without a blush, as "of no religion."

Such, we fear, has been the career of many. And whilst we utterly deny the truth of many widely-circulated statements founded upon statistical details which have been triumphantly refuted, we acknowledge with shame that much of the benefit which the Church ought to have derived from emigration has been heretofore lost not by the perversion to Protestantism of our settlers, but by the want of means to sustain their devotional feelings and to educate the young, and their consequent lapse into infidelity. We have pointed to the causes of our losses; let us now ask ourselves whether we have done all that could have been done to avert them; whether we have done our best to excite and cherish in our emigrants that spirit of devotion which is required for their high vocation of Christian missionaries? Have we instilled into them, before they left our shores, or after their arrival in their adopted country, the determination to extend the Faith to others, or even to preserve it in their own children? If so, have we given them such an education as would enable them rightly to employ a generous zeal? Have we so fostered the missionary spirit abroad and at home, and so consolidated our missionary organisation, as to secure the spread of truth and the extension of God's Church through the ministrations of a sufficient number of clergy?

There are peculiarities in the social structure of America which render it especially difficult adequately to recruit the ranks of the clergy by any efforts there. The democratic nature of its institutions is unfavourable to the development of that spirit of perfect obedience, which is as essential for a Christian clergy as its co-relative humility is for a Christian people. Moreover, a preponderating energy about secular things has a fatal tendency to dim spiritual aspirations. Consequently it is difficult to obtain a sufficient number of vocations to supply the clergy (especially the regular clergy) needed for the people, exclusive of emigrants; and it must be recollected that in a country such as the United States, where no religion is specially fostered by the legislature, a larger number of clergy is required, because a more unrestricted field is laid open. It is not, therefore, reasonable or just to expect that America should furnish priests for her immigrants. Whence, then, are they to be obtained? What country is to enjoy the glorious privilege of propagating and sustaining the Truth? That country which sends forth the great mass of Catholic emigrants. Yes; Ireland, which for so many centuries has

strained the Truth to her heart; which when persecuted has refused to abandon it, and when offered bribes has refused to sell it;—Ireland, which has preferred her Faith to food, to raiment, to liberty, even to life; which has loved it with an orphan's love, and revered it with a filial duty;—Ireland, which, amid the barbarism of ancient times, sent forth her Christian saints and sages to teach, and save, and shine throughout all time like stars through a moral darkness. She has been heretofore the witness of the Faith; once again, though unconsciously to herself, she has undertaken the solemn duty of propagating it. She is pouring forth her peasant missionaries by hundreds of thousands; a band of unconscious crusaders, who, whilst they imagine that they are but flying from the pressure of physical wants, or escaping from social serfdom, religious persecution, or political degradation,—or that the gratification of a restless love of change, or the acquisition of an almost fabled wealth, are the sole end of their movements,—are in truth obeying a divine impulse, and will prove, in the fulness of time, to have been the apostles of Catholicism. Let her remember, then, that she contains within herself the power, under God, to render this her necessity effective to the salvation of man. She, and she alone of all the nations of the earth, can supply the materials and the organisation necessary for success. Let her have the aspiration to accomplish the will of the Almighty. She has the power, and, if she uses it aright, shall have the reward.

If she has been afflicted by pestilence and famine; if, for centuries, she has been lashed into rebellion, and lashed back again into servitude; if she has been a by-word of reproach amongst those who could not understand and would not appreciate her, calling her piety bigotry, and her resignation slothfulness; she may yet have to bow the head in thankfulness to Him who has ordained that her very wrongs and miseries shall be the means of sending her forth to cover the earth with His Faith. He has gathered the waters in His hand, and poured them over the four quarters of the world, and they bear upon their ample bosom the emblem of salvation, the cross of Christ.

We are aware that the supply of clergy necessary for the Church even in Ireland can with difficulty be obtained there at present, and that it may therefore appear paradoxical to assert that from Ireland a sufficient number of clergy may be obtained to accompany emigrants, and enable them to fulfil their mission; but we believe this difficulty to arise from causes which, if not immediately removable, yet at least admit of important modification. Certainly the materials (so to speak)



for ecclesiastical vocations are abundant in that country. The character of the Irish people is, to a remarkable degree, both intelligent and devotional; and in the combination of these two qualities, which but too frequently are not found to co-exist, may be recognised the fruit and the reward of a dutiful obedience to the Church. Both qualities, however, are susceptible of very great increase, if cultivated with care; and for this cultivation we look with confidence to the exertions of the Irish clergy. Faithful and assiduous as their ministerial labours have ever been during centuries of obloquy and persecution, they are becoming every day even more energetic; and that energy cannot but be still further increased by the immediate necessities of Ireland itself, and the misguided zeal of those by whom those necessities are employed as the weapons of a proselytising war. Before the famine, the enormous amount of population committed to the charge of the pastors; its extreme destitution; the unsettled and mendicant habits of a large proportion of the poor; the arduous struggle for religious liberty; and, we may perhaps truly add, a certain false security which was generated by a system apparently working well,—had a tendency to impede the exertions of the clergy, and disposed the people to be contented with fidelity to their Faith, rather than to aspire after any high standard of sanctity. Now, a diminution of nearly one-fourth of the population has lessened the numbers of those to whom spiritual ministrations are to be applied. The poorest of the poor have been condensed into masses in the workhouses, and placed under the immediate watchfulness of the chaplains. The whole nation is thoroughly aroused to the necessity of defending the liberty of its Faith from the attacks of its political enemies. The prodigious increase of Irish emigration has manifested the necessity of fortifying the faith of the people, so as to enable it to withstand the trials which are sure to assail it; and the renewed vigour with which sectarian animosity, and an unscrupulous propagandism supported by English gold, have recommenced their warfare against Irish Catholicism, is calling forth, daily more and more, the energy of the people and of the Church, and teaching them to co-operate in organising adequate measures of defence.

It is not for us to speak of those improvements in the ecclesiastical and social system which have been already so well begun by those to whose province they belong. Nevertheless, there are certain minor accessories on which we will venture to say a few words, as being within the legitimate sphere of lay co-operation. And first, it is certain that much may be done by investing all that belongs to the service of the

altar with that pomp and beauty and perfection which the Church has appointed, but which it was difficult, not to say impossible, for a persecuted Church fully to sustain. That reverence for the majesty of the Almighty which shewed itself in the adornment of all that is specially consecrated to His service, extending downwards to the minutest article of ecclesiastical use, from the gigantic proportions of the mediæval cathedrals, with their towers and pinnacles, their windows—the glory of the most distinguished artists—their rich fretwork and their solemn aisles, which seemed, as it were, overburdened with the presence of the Deity, until the majestic voice of the organ pealed forth, and the incense of the holy offering set free the power of adoration, and uplifted the heart of man to commune with his God,—all this outward display of reverence was not only a tribute to Him at whose feet it was offered, but was also inculcated by the Church as a means for animating devotional fervour. The pomp and circumstance of Catholic worship always contains a hidden meaning, and is emblematical of veiled truths; and the imagination of man, that attribute in which he may be said to have the nearest affinity to the divine essence, was wisely appealed to for the purpose of bringing him nearer to his Creator. The Irish are a people of an active imagination. It has often led them into faults and follies, but if cultivated in the manner to which we have alluded would be productive of the happiest results. We apprehend that there are but few parishes in Ireland in which it would not be possible to organise altar-societies, which, under the proper clerical superintendence, might undertake the care of the sanctuary, collect a sufficient contribution, and, as they sought for aid and explained their object, prepare the public mind to appreciate and derive benefit from the improvement. It is before the altar that the aspirant after Christian chivalry must watch his armour—from the altar that he must gain his strength; and all that tends to add splendour and magnificence to the altar, tends also to purify and elevate the minds of those who worship at it.

Another means for improving at once the intellectual and religious culture of the people might be found in the institution, on a general scale, of reading societies, accessible even to the very poor. The system of national education, valuable as it has proved for the imparting of secular information, and which, under the present circumstances of the country, is perhaps the only system universally practicable, is nevertheless wholly unsuited for the communication of religious knowledge, or the calling forth of devotional fervour. Reading societies, such as we allude to, might do much to supply these deficiencies.



It would not be difficult to make them self-supporting. A small subscription (if it were only of two or three shillings a-year) from each family, would, at the present prices of books, secure a considerable store of valuable reading for the whole society; and, at the close of the year, the books might become the property of the subscribers. The society would of course be under the guidance of the parish priest, who would prepare lists, embracing not only works of a strictly religious character, but publications of general interest and amusement,—and above all, the records of missionary enterprise—from which the members might select their orders. Heretofore, the defence of Catholicity has been nearly limited to works of a controversial nature, too learned and too heavy for the poor; but within a recent period, cheaper and better publications have appeared. Catholic works of fiction are coming out every day, many of which are gracefully written, and combine instruction with the deepest interest. Contradictions of some, at least, of those Protestant falsifications of history which, ever since the days of Hume and Robertson, have been republished in every cheap and attractive form, can now be had upon the cheapest terms, written with truth and ability. English history and popular controversy are well handled in the “Clifton Tracts.” Catholic biographies, Catholic travels, both secular and missionary, and Catholic poetry, are in the field against their Protestant rivals. The diffusion of this class of literature amongst the poor would be particularly useful in Ireland, where the publications generally current in the cottages are of a most frivolous stamp, and often of an immoral tendency. The poor boy, returning from school, would feel a warmer devotion as he recognised the influence which religion has exercised over the actions of men and the progress of the arts; and he would diffuse what he felt. When the schoolboy has grown up into the man, much can be done for his spiritual edification, apart from the ordinary ministrations of the clergy; as, for instance, by encouraging voluntary associations of a religious character. Societies, imitated from those which flourished in the middle ages, have made their appearance in many large towns, and might easily be extended to populous country districts. They are composed of young Catholics, whose days are devoted to laborious occupations; and their rules prescribe a diligent performance of religious duties, and punish by expulsion any infraction of the moral law. In the evenings they meet, listen to lectures delivered sometimes by laymen, but more generally by the clergy, in which the politics of the day are a forbidden topic; and by their mutual intercourse they encourage one another to devotion, sobriety, and order. It is manifest that an en-

larged development of this system would not only confer many social benefits, but would sustain the religious impressions received in early youth, would stimulate parents to secure for their children the advantages which they had enjoyed themselves; and if circumstances should hereafter send them forth as emigrants to the New World, they would go out not only steadfast in the faith themselves, but able and anxious to impart it to others also.

From a universal effort in aid of the Association for the Propagation of the Faith we might expect the most signal advantage. Many excellent men may be of opinion that, in the present circumstances of Ireland, this subject is premature, and that there are objects of more pressing necessity which call for the contributions of the faithful. Such men may say, "Charity begins at home, and our own people have need of all that we can do." But a little consideration will shew that this is a narrow and fallacious view, and not one which consults the best for the immediate or ultimate benefit of religion. Men who reason thus forget that the population of Ireland can be no longer considered as a fixed body, but as a vast community perpetually on the move; and that those who have gone, and have yet to go, are associated with the old country by the ties of kindred, patriotism, and religion. They are surely entitled to religious sympathy and to support. Even in an economic point of view, a narrow is a mistaken policy; for the accounts of the association shew that, out of funds contributed by all Catholic Christendom, a portion has been devoted to Irish purposes larger than the amount of subscriptions contributed in Ireland; and it is reasonable to expect that if those subscriptions should be largely increased, the same proportion of outlay in favour of Ireland would still continue. But such are not the considerations which should determine our conduct. The broad path of duty lies before us, clearly defined. Let us not dare to neglect it, lest we should hereafter be called to account for souls lost through our apathy or selfishness. Let us remember what Catholicity is, and wherein it differs from all other religions; that its spirit is *universal*, every where pervasive. It is limited to no country, confined within no boundaries. It is set like a sun in the highest heavens, and the great world is spread out like a sea before it to be enlightened by its rays. It is by the inculcation of this doctrine, founded as it is upon the illimitable nature of divine love, and belonging to the very essence of the Catholic Church, that the devotion of Catholics may be most powerfully excited; and we cannot see any opportunity for more amply illustrating it, and more vigorously calling it forth to life and action, than when the priest exhibits



to his flock, as St. Paul did to the early Christians, the toils, the sufferings, the perseverance, the ardent zeal tempered by meekness, the patient love, the steadfast faith, the glorious success, and the still more glorious martyrdoms of the apostles and missionaries of the Cross. Every penny contributed by each poor man will, when the nature of the contribution is rightly explained, enlarge the sphere of his religious vision, and be a fountain of love to his fellow-men. Moreover, if we attempt to circumscribe our Christian charity, where are the limits to be laid down? They will not stop at a kingdom, or a province, or a parish. They will soon come down to families or to individuals, and that universal sympathy which is the very genius of Catholicity will be lost in utter selfishness. A martyrdom in China ought to send a vibration to the heart of every Catholic parish in England or Ireland. The boldest policy is the safest also. The extension of Catholicity abroad will have its reaction *here*; and, if we may be permitted to draw an analogy between temporal and spiritual things, we may remember that the Roman empire did not accomplish the conquest of Italy until it had spread its dominion over the continents of Europe, Asia, and Africa.

The system of education adopted by the National Board is, as we have said, not well calculated to call forth devotional tendencies. It is clear, therefore, that for this important purpose it is necessary not only to improve to the utmost the national system by affording the greatest amount of spiritual cultivation which can be given without violating its rules, but to have Church schools in addition. We have observed with pleasure the establishment of Catholic Ragged Schools in Dublin; and it is to be hoped that the admirable educational institutions of the Christian Brothers\* may, by degrees, spread themselves over the country. If the parochial clergy, in the instruction of their Sunday classes, had to deal with children already grounded in the rudiments of their creed, they would be able to address themselves more to their hearts; and if their pulpit discourses were to be delivered to persons who had previously had a careful moral training in a really religious school, they would be enabled more successfully to excite their devotional fervour, and to give to that object a portion of the time which is now necessarily occupied in explaining to them the doctrines of their religion or the requirements of the moral

\* The Christian Brothers' schools in England and Ireland amount to 105, in which 15,910 children are taught. In Ireland there are 81 schools, and 10,370 scholars; but of these, 46 schools and 6010 scholars are in the cities of Dublin, Cork, Waterford, and Limerick, and nearly all the remainder are to be found in the large towns.

law. But, important as the more general infusion of the religious element into the ordinary course of education would be, more still would be required for the development of that character to which we must look for supplying the necessary number of clergy. Special training for that special purpose is needed; and until it is adequately supplied—more especially for the middle and upper classes, for whom at present there is least provision,—we cannot feel that all has been done.

We should be wanting in gratitude if we were not to acknowledge with the deepest thankfulness the exertions of the Christian Doctrine Confraternities, which give religious instruction in Dublin to nearly 14,000 pupils; and those of the eminent ecclesiastics who have devoted themselves gratuitously to the education of young missionaries in the college of All Hallows, at Drumcondra, near Dublin.\* This admirable institution now contains nearly 100 students, and every subscription or bequest of ten pounds annually secures a place for one additional. Ten pounds a year, contributed by pence out of the earnings of the poor, or a like sum from a rich man, saved by declining the purchase of some superfluity, may thus be the means of administering spiritual consolation to at least a thousand of our emigrant fellow-countrymen. It cannot be expected that this college, with the addition of a few brought up for missionary purposes in the colleges of Carlow and Thurles, should supply the demands of an emigration which for several years will probably number 150,000 annually, and will cause in America an annual demand for at least 150 additional priests: but, if properly supported, it would do a great deal; and we must always recollect, what we have already insisted upon, that every effort in the cause of charity and religion will tend to excite and to sustain religious fervour, and to make those who leave our shores lay, if not ecclesiastical, missionaries.

We have now pointed to a few of the more prominent means by which the great wants that we have described may be in part supplied, and the great opportunity vouchsafed to us improved. Many of our observations apply to England as well as Ireland, though we have spoken chiefly of that country of which the Catholic population is comparatively large, and the emigrants of which are Catholic. We are painfully conscious of the imperfections of our sketch; but we have considered it our duty to lay before our readers the paramount necessity of the case, and the serious responsibility connected

\* Since this article was in type, we have received an interesting letter on the subject of this college, which will be found in the "Correspondence," and to which we desire to call our readers' particular attention.



with this particular period. A few years, and the opportunity may have passed. Let us not leave it to the sects to avail themselves of it. Our suggestions have not been made in the spirit of undue interference, but have been prompted by an honest desire to promote Catholic interests, and to extend the knowledge of the truth. In speaking of Ireland, and endeavouring to shew that that country may be made, what it deserves to be, the great nursery of missionary enterprise, we acknowledge, with sentiments of the deepest respect, admiration, and gratitude, the learning, the piety, the constancy, and untiring exertions of the clergy of that country; and we anticipate with confidence that they will in time accomplish all and a great deal more than we have ventured to recommend. In America the arrears of the past constitute the opportunity of the present, and leave a great harvest to be rapidly gathered in, or finally lost. A subject of such importance, and embracing so many details, can only be touched upon in the most cursory manner within our present limits; but even a few words may direct attention to the great principles involved, and the great issues at stake; and when we look to all that has been done in Ireland within the last few years, we cannot but feel trustful as to the future. It would be idle to suppose that the work before us could be accomplished all at once. It is of a nature which especially requires time, and demands steady perseverance. Nor, we fear, would it be reasonable to calculate upon the possibility of at once obtaining the funds necessary for carrying it out to its fullest extent. A certain amount of sacrifice must indeed be made at first. But for what object is it required? For extending the Faith to countless millions; for sustaining in the truth and love of God those poor outcasts, our own flesh and bone, to whom we can no longer offer shelter or support at home; for effecting this through the instrumentality, under God, of a country that has loved the truth and suffered for it. Ireland is called upon to make this sacrifice by every feeling of devotion, every sentiment of patriotism; Catholic England by religious duty, and by gratitude, remembering that to Ireland she is indebted for a support which has broken the force of the recent persecution, that *her* exertions won Emancipation, and that if the great English manufacturing towns are enlightened by Catholic preaching, and preserved from infidelity by the ministration of Catholic priests, it is in a great measure due to that very spirit of missionary emigration which she is now called upon to foster. But the cause is not that of England and Ireland only. It is the cause of all Catholic Christendom. It is the

battle of the Faith; and Catholics, wherever they may be, are required to contribute their aid.

The spirit of emigration, though apparently resulting from human agencies, we look upon as a providential indication of the Divine will. We cannot control it, but we may direct it; and if we do not, we are guilty of sacrilege in disposing of the gifts of God. We neglect at once our duty to our Creator and to our fellow-creatures. He who, by His miraculous interposition, has preserved the Truth in the hearts of a faithful people, now commands them to disperse that treasure throughout the world. He commands His Church to assist that people to fulfil their destiny. We may not dare to doubt the result. We shall see our people leaving our shores accompanied by the ministers of God, going forth not as exiles and outcasts, but with the fearless spirit and high aspirations of Christian missionaries. We shall see them, when settled in foreign lands, not devoting themselves to the headlong pursuit of wealth, forgetful of all Christian duties, but honest and obedient subjects, humble and faithful Catholics, assisting their brethren by their charity, directing them by their advice, cheering them if they faint, teaching them if they be ignorant, consoling them in their affliction, confirming the faith of the wavering, and, by their example and their teaching, educating their own children in the purity of the Faith, and spreading its holy influence around them.

*Per varios casus, per tot discrimina rerum,  
Tendimus in Latium;  
Durate, et vosmet rebus servate secundis.*

---

---

## MADELEINE, THE ROSIÈRE.

### CHAPTER VIII.

“AND now, Madeleine,” said her father, drawing her to a chair beside his own, when the hostess had quitted the room, “I want to speak seriously to you.” His manner was totally changed; it was polished, almost elegant; so much so, that, combined with the language, she stared with amazement, asking herself the question—“whether this man ever could have been a workman?” Then her unsophisticated nature arranged all, by concluding that, forced by poverty to gain a living by any honest means, he had subdued his pride to labour manually, and to seem what by birth he was not. For she



knew her father had been decently educated, and bred up for better things than his fate afterwards destined him to. "In the first place," he continued, "we must change your name; I have my reasons for that, which you need not know at present; I will arrange secrecy with Madame Leon. Drop the Madeleine awhile; you must be called ——"

"Let me be called Therèse, then, my poor mother's name," she anxiously asked.

"No," he replied, "that will not do either; what signifies the name you bear for a while? Justine will do as well as any other; so let it be Justine. Remember *this*, for 'tis of consequence, breathe neither name nor history to any one: I will say you have been at school in Normandy; say as little as possible about it."

"But all this will be untrue, father," she said, looking up in his face. "I cannot tell a falsehood."

"Pshaw, child! you will tell many before you die. But as you have a scruple; why, I suppose you have been at school? the Bertrands sent you to one?"

"Yes, father. But how do you know all about them so well?" And her eyes distended with surprise.

"Never mind that; I knew you lived, and all about you, you see; still I had not resolved when to claim you. You were well off; I not rich; I would not bring you to poverty."

"My dear, kind father," she cried, pressing his hand; and her heart began almost to trust and love, where she had feared so much at first. "Yes, I have been at school," she added, "several years; but only a day-scholar."

"Never mind, that will do; as you are so very scrupulous about the truth, if asked, you can say you have been at school. I will arrange the rest, for you will meet few persons except in my company, and young ladies should be reserved." A smile lit up his cold face.

"Young ladies!" she cried. "But you are only a poor man, are you, father? And I have come to share and help your poverty."

"This is very good of you," he answered; "and though I am not rich, yet I am not so poor as you imagine."

"But you were working for Monsieur Lafon?"

"True; a momentary poverty. I have inherited some money lately, and am about taking a cottage outside the *Barrière* here; I daresay I shall make you comfortable enough, if you are a good girl. But *à propos*, Justine, tell me how and why you left Nogent?"

Madeleine sighed heavily; the excitement of the past hour had driven home, for it was her heart's home, from her

thoughts. She, however, briefly related all particulars to her father—her love for Alexis, the scene in the church, and the one in her chamber at midnight. When she named this, Gilles stared in wonder and amazement, he was speechless for awhile; then rising hastily, paced the room, convulsed with laughter. Madeleine stared like one bereft of sense.

“Why,” he said at last, struggling to be calm, “you must be the victim of some jest, or mad somnambulist, or something of the sort, to tell me such a tale expecting me to believe it.”

“Father,” she exclaimed energetically, “go and ask *le curé* if I am not speaking truth.”

“I do not doubt your belief in it, but it could never have happened; no man would convict himself. Were you other than you are, child, I should say you had been taking strong drink; as it is, you have dreamed it.”

“No, father, it occurred as I tell you; for Alexis has since written to a friend, saying he had found a substitute; and how procure that without money? Then the flowers left in my room were found, the prints of the ladder; how account for all this?”

“Well, never mind,” he hastily said; “you acted foolishly in betraying him. Where is he?”

“The gendarmes were sent to bring him a prisoner,” she uttered in deep suffering.

“What a stupid affair!” he cried, rising impatiently and making a few steps forward; then stopping and facing her, he added, “mind, speak to *no one* of this. I would not have your name implicated in such an affair; drop Nogent altogether. And hearken, Justine, it will be necessary for me to leave you here a few days; but I shall be near you, with you I should say; the fact is, I have not yet quite decided upon a house. This, though a very humble auberge, is kept by a most excellent woman; one, too, with whom I wish to be on terms, for reasons too lengthy to tell you; but, remember, whilst we stay, not one word of your past life—of Nogent, the Bertrands, any thing, in short—but she will not question you; keep in your own room, unless I take you out. By the way, what clothes have you? have you no bonnet? only that cap?”

“No, father, I left all behind me. I thought my father a poor workman; I came as his child should come.”

“Very humble and very meek,” and he patted her bowed head; “I see I shall be able to mould you to my wishes,—my habits, I mean,—I am odd to deal with at times; but I will see to all, or Madame Leon shall. You must have a



bonnet and veil, and never go out without the latter down; these Bertrands will of course seek you, and I cannot afford to part with my child now I have found her. Adieu, Justine. I will send Madame to you presently. Remember all I have said; be silent." And embracing her affectionately, he quitted the room, and she heard the key grate in the lock.

Poor Madeleine, left alone, fell into deep thought. Her greatest trouble was a strange feeling of disappointment that her father should be other than she had fancied him—a simple workman. It was not a romantic idea, but a noble one. She had fled in search of him as a duty, to cheer his poverty, and perhaps comfort and soothe him in trouble; she came to find a gay, prosperous man, towards whom, though her father, she could not approach unfearingly, so much had her first impression of repulsion left a trace on her heart. Depend upon it, reader, that this is an instinct given us by Heaven's gift—nature; we have it in common with the animal, bird, and insect. We should always look warily upon the person against whom our heart revolted *at first sight*.

Madame Leon came soon afterwards to that room, whose occupant had been weeping over past scenes, lost friends, and, above all, Alexis's trouble, of which she had been so unhappily the cause. Not a question was asked by this woman; her manner was kind, motherly, and affectionate; without a remark, she prefaced her conversation by calling her, with respect but not servility, "Mademoiselle Justine," as if to shew her that she had been tutored, and could be trusted. She went on to say, that as a great many persons frequented the house, some a little wild,—

"A woman alone, a widow as I am," she said, "cannot always restrain them, so your father wishes you to remain entirely in the room I will prepare for you upstairs; but you shall not be dull, I will come to you and bring you some books; do you like play-books?"

"I never read any; I don't think I should," she replied.

"How strange!" ejaculated the woman; "but then Monsieur Frémont" (it was *Monsieur* Frémont now, not Gilles) "tells me you have been very strictly brought up; well, what can I give you to amuse you, my child?"

"I can work very well, or embroider, if you have any to do, Madame," answered poor Madeleine, thinking at the same time that at dear Nogent she had never needed to seek amusement; for when not employed at home she was engaged in some way for the *curé*, visiting his poor or sick, or decorating the chapel.

"What are you thinking of, Mademoiselle Justine?"

Instead of answering, Madeleine began to weep in silence, —those tears which chill the very heart, they fall so hopeless and cold.

“Ah, well! I must not inquire,” continued the woman kindly, and herself affected; “but there, my child,” and she took her hand, “don’t think me a cold-hearted mere hostess of—of—this auberge,” she added, as if lost for a word; “I had a heart as gentle as your own once, perhaps circumstances make us—” again she seemed at a loss, “worldly,” she concluded; “but if you ever want a friend,” and she lowered her voice cautiously, “*and you may*, come fearlessly to me, I will be one to you; for you have interested me much, poor child!”

Madeleine pressed her hand, and gratefully thanked her, adding at the same time,—

“But I think I shall be able to make my father love me, and he will be kind to me.”

“Perhaps; but men are changeable. He is still young, he may marry, or neglect you, or—in short, remember what I have said, and keep it to yourself. Now I will go and make your room comfortable.” And kissing the fair, smooth brow, she quitted the room; and again the key turned in the lock outside.

#### CHAPTER IX.

A fortnight after the above events, the hostess of ‘*Au bon Enfant*’ sat in the room we have just quitted, and a man beside her, but of a style totally different from Gilles Frémont, though about the same age. He was rather tall, and assuredly had been handsome, but care or toil had made sad ravages in his appearance; his countenance was sad, almost approaching to gloom and sullenness; he looked like one who had passed all his noon of life on the edge of a running stream, striving to stay the ever-fleeting shadows of the sun, finding only at last, when the luminary sank to rest and set in all his western glory, that they were *but* shadows, and the night, cold and chill, around him. There was a restlessness in his eye too, painful to behold, a look of terror and suspicion. With all these faults of countenance, he was a man of any thing but unpleasing aspect; he rather inspired confidence and liking; his class was more the mechanic, as indicated both by dress and language, than the gentleman; with him too Madame Leon seemed quite at her ease.

“Pierre Frison,” she said, in continuation of their previous conversation, “I wish you would go at once to Frémont’s; I don’t quite like the way he is acting; you know it is a rule



I make never to betray a secret confided to me, when I have promised to keep it; it wouldn't do in my position here; so I can tell you no more than this, that he has kept this girl's existence concealed up to the present time, for reasons best known to himself; he has educated her well, but never scarcely went to see her, and she, tired of school and the friends he had confided her to, ran away, and came alone to Paris to seek him."

"But how did she trace him?" asked the other in surprise, and thoughtfully.

"Oh, she had an address, or clue, I suppose, but more than this I cannot say. But what I want you to do is this—" she paused an instant and looked down. "Look here, Pierre Frison," she said at last resolutely, "there is a chord left untouched by the world, however bad we may be, in most persons' hearts; this girl has found mine, and made it resound; lost as we may be, it is impossible to come in contact with a creature like Justine, and not bow down before her; her simple purity, firm truth, and uncanting religion, even the few days she was here, have made me think much. I have seen much that is good and worthy in you, Pierre; I know you will not laugh at what I say; but it would almost break my heart to know wrong came to that child."

"What can I do?" he asked coldly; "she is with her father; surely he will see no evil happens to her."

"He!" she cried contemptuously; "don't you yet know what Gilles Frémont is? will he spare any one, if to act otherwise would suit him better? This girl he has placed at the head of an establishment, a pavilion surrounded by gardens and high walls at Batignolles, and there she serves by her beauty, most unconsciously, as a decoy for young men who are plundered by him and his associates."

"You have suddenly grown very scrupulous," he replied sarcastically.

"And you reckless, Pierre; when first I knew you, a year since, you were not thus. Whatever you might have done, still you had feeling; but since that last affair at—"

"Hush!" he exclaimed with an oath, "do not speak of *that*; what I did before was in fair war; if men are fools, and will play with wiser hands, they must expect to lose, 'tis all fair; when I could get honest work, however humble, I did it, and set the rest aside; but a man cannot starve; but this last affair has made a felon of me, and I am hand and foot in Frémont's power: I would to Heaven I had never met that man!"

"Well but, Pierre," she said soothingly, "you did not

profit by it; you were drunk when you did it; you gave all to him."

"True, but I helped to commit the act, and it hangs like a curse over me. I cannot be honest now. I went to seek work the other day; but I have not returned since, though it was promised me. This curse is over me: I would I had never seen that man!"

"And, Pierre, 'tis with such a man you would leave a perfectly innocent girl, though his child."

"What would you have me do?" he asked again.

"Go and see him, and go often; I have confidence in you."

"But he fights shy of me; I met him the other day, dashingy dressed, and I suppose he didn't like my shabby clothes, for he just gave me a nod, and hurried on; besides, he comes here no more."

"Go there, Pierre; he *dare* not refuse to receive you; go boldly, go to-night: he has a party, I know; some of *ours* are to be there, and several strangers; tell Justine privately that I bade you see her; for, poor child, she grew confiding in me before she left, and she went downhearted enough, I can tell you."

"I'll see her to-night," was Pierre's reply, though gloomily given; "I should be sorry evil befel an innocent girl; if I can avert it, I will; there are enough bad ones in the world by inclination; if I can keep one well-intentioned right, I'll do it; she is just sixteen, you say? poor child, only sixteen!" and the man sighed.

Madame Leon had told the exact truth. Madeleine had found a father, but he was one better never known to one like herself; and yet the unsophisticated child of village life was blinded to his mode of existence and her own position; but she was most unhappy, all her expectations in finding him had been crushed; she came to win and receive a father's love, and great as her efforts were, she could not give hers; all true affection must be based on respect; without it, 'tis a gossamer's web broken by a breeze. How respect a man who surrounded her with falsehood? and how disentangle herself? True, she only tacitly permitted it, by not revealing her real name; but every day she had to encounter some painful scene with him, where her strict probity and truthfulness made war against some effort of his to destroy them, by leading her to duplicity, or abetting him in schemes revolting, though incomprehensible to her. Over her prudent conduct with regard to his many visitors he alone watched with almost more than a father's jealous eye, though no such watching was needed, for all her thoughts were with Alexis, and he perhaps in prison; for of



his fate she could ascertain nothing, and this suspense and ignorance about all she loved were killing her. Her father had made her solemnly promise to communicate with no one unknown to him; she promised, and even he had perfect faith in her truth. It is not to be supposed that one so fair as she was passed unnoticed among her father's guests. No, this would not have suited him; she was in his house to allure and attract. Richly dressed, she shone as a bright gem alone in the company of mere fossils, unpolished and dim; all paid court and homage to this fair, cold girl; her very manner pleased her father more than a livelier nature would have done; it piqued all to win her to smile, until it was well known to him, that she stood as a magnet to attract many; and it became a summons of pleasurable anticipation to more than one man of some fashionable club in Paris, "Let us go to-night and see Frémont's fair daughter."

And thus his *salons* were renowned and filled. Madeleine always retired early; this heightened the desire to see her: she was not allowed to sell her society too cheaply, and with joy she quitted the rooms, where, though there was not high play until she retired, still she saw enough to grieve and wound her. Then too, in consequence of her firm refusal to meet Frémont's views in something not clear to her right judgment, he had forbidden her even to go to church or her duties; indeed, from the first permission to fulfil the latter was unwillingly accorded; like *all* acting wrongly, he had a fear and detestation of the priesthood. In vain she implored, entreated; he seized the first excuse to prohibit even Mass to her: here, however, she was firm in a refusal to promise not to go. "Father," she said, and the girl was all woman in spirit, "only in this must I disobey you; you are my earthly parent tis 'true, but I have One above you; He has never deserted me, and His laws I must obey."

"I dare you to go, Justine," he cried in anger; "I defy you, unless I choose."

"Perhaps so, father," she said meekly; "but if I can, I shall; nothing shall extort a contrary promise from me."

"But I tell you, Justine, you cannot, unless I choose; I am master here."

"I know that, father, and must submit; but you cannot control my thoughts or prayers. I can pray for you and myself, even in my chamber, and placing faith where it is due, I trust to be heard, and I *know* I shall be upheld in all trials." And as she crept upstairs in tears to her room, the same shadow with silken wings so meekly folded, which had walked beside her when she quitted Nogent to seek her father,

glided step by step up the stairs with her, and stood looking upon her in peace and love, as she knelt down and offered herself to Him who had made her so upright, yet so suffering.

It was to this girl Pierre Frison came an unwelcome guest in her father's house. When he entered—for he came early—only one or two were assembled, and these were men evidently of their own stamp, known to each. Frémont's brow knit in ill-suppressed rage when Pierre was announced.

"I came," said this latter, assuming a tone of cheerfulness widely different to the one he had used when speaking to Madame Leon, "Frémont, to be presented to your handsome daughter; every one is speaking of her."

"Where?" asked Frémont sulkily; "people are very busy."

"What! does that annoy you? you should close your doors, then; and on the contrary, I hear of your *fêtes* from all the world; I did not venture sooner, for I am a homely man, and I was not in great funds, nor dressed well enough to meet your visitors; but to-day a friend lent me some money and this suit of clothes, so I have come; I knew you would be glad to see me."

"So I am, Pierre, don't doubt it," answered the master, clearing his brow by an effort; "but I doubt if Justine will come down this evening, I hear she is not very well; I will go and see." And he hurried towards the door, purposing to desire her not to appear that evening, for some motive best known to himself; but as he approached the door, it opened, and Madeleine herself entered. Frémont started back.

"I heard you were ill, and not coming down," he said hurriedly.

"No, father," she replied, "I am quite well: who told you so?"

"Well, Josephine, I think; but never mind, I rejoice to see you; here is an old friend of mine wishing to be presented to you," and he led her towards Pierre Frison.

Frison stared, as if some magnetic influence attracted him; then bowing awkwardly, said with homely warmth, very different to the polished phraseology of those who generally met in her father's rooms, "Oh, how lovely mademoiselle is! very lovely! they did not speak half highly enough of her, and she looks so good. Permit an old man to shake you by the hand." And he suited the action to the word.

Though the words were all praise of her beauty, still there was nothing of gallantry in them; they were naturally uttered, and nature spoke to her own child in Madeleine. She started at the homely voice, it recalled her village home; and giving her hand freely, she looked up in the speaker's face with a



smile, which many of her gay young gallants from club and hall would have envied.

Frémont, the keen man of the world, saw in an instant this freemasonry of thought between them, and again he frowned.

"Come, Frison," he said, "though you call yourself old, you are my junior, and I allow no one of any age to make free with Justine, not even an old friend like yourself; hands off, Pierre."

"I forgot my polished manners," he replied, smiling; "but mademoiselle looked so natural, so unlike our grand ladies in general, that I thought I was once more in my village, and not Paris." And, awkwardly bowing, he followed Frémont to a seat beside his own; but the train was lighted, the two village hearts had met in a world of spirits, ever above our heads, guiding sympathising souls together. They sat apart, but both wished to be beside one another; and when fresh arrivals poured in, despite the obvious vigilance and uneasiness of Frémont, Pierre in his awkward unpolished manner drew near Madeleine, and the girl smiled again as he dropped into a seat near her own, and said in a low tone, without preface:—

"Mademoiselle, a friend, a sincere one of yours, Madame Leon, urged me to come to-night; she fears you may not be happy, and she bade me tell you always to remember her; if she can serve you, you may rely upon her; she is well and honestly disposed towards you."

And Madeleine firmly believed it, because he said so; so much does true honesty of purpose gild the humblest page of the human countenance, and make us read it in clear bold characters. Her reply, though in questioning, proved this.

"Shall you come here often? I hope you will. Do, Monsieur Frison, and tell Madame Leon I never shall forget her kindness, or fail to seek it in my need."

"I am glad I came, and I did not want to do so," he said, in the same low tone; "for I saw the other day that Frémont looked coldly upon me, and I see it more so to-night; but I neither know the cause, nor care. I shall return soon; and take care of yourself, *petite*, for you are here alone among all these wild men."

"But my father never leaves me," she replied. Frison seemed about to say something serious; twice he essayed, then checking himself added, after a peculiar look towards Frémont—

"Don't trust any one *here*; fathers cannot always watch; be on your guard; I will see you again soon somehow. Now,

good-night, *ma fille*; I see Gilles wishes me gone; take care of yourself."

And unseen by Frémont, whose attention had been momentarily drawn aside, for he had scarcely taken his eyes off them, being unable to leave a table where *écarté* was being arranged, Pierre grasped her hand again with his homely grasp, and Madeleine almost burst into tears as he rose, so much had his manner, his "*petite*" and "*ma fille*," recalled Nogent and its associations.

---

## Reviews.

### DR. NEWMAN'S STYLE AND METHOD OF ARGUMENT.

*Discourses on the Scope and Nature of University Education.*

By J. H. Newman, D.D., President of the Catholic University of Ireland, &c. Dublin, J. Duffy.

THIS work of Father Newman's, which we ought to have noticed sooner, and cannot even now notice as it deserves, consists of ten discourses, with a preface and an appendix. The first discourse is partly personal to himself, and contains, among other things, an apology for appealing so much to Protestant authorities, and to his own convictions, which were gradually matured during the period while he was still an alien from the Church. In the next four discourses he first assumes that a university is a place for teaching *universal* knowledge, and thence proves that it cannot consistently do this without the Church; because general knowledge is connected together in one system or circle, so as to be one philosophy, and theology is a constituent element of this circle; further, because the nature of the intellect is such, that it will complete its circle of knowledge for itself, and will fill up the gaps left by its ignorance of certain branches of science by an unwarrantable extension of the adjacent sciences, so as to cover the vacant spaces. Hence not only is knowledge, considered as a unity, damaged by the omission of a constituent element, but also its other branches are distorted and misapplied in being made to fulfil ends for which they are not adapted. In the sixth and two following discourses he examines that precise work which is the aim and scope of university education, and which is in fact liberal knowledge, the perfection and beauty of the intellect; an end to be sought for itself, though it bring no other



fruit. It is not an aggregate of mental acquirements, like the miscellaneous aimless learning of a Jeremy Taylor; but it is the system, the form, the life, which a philosophy gives to these acquirements, and that true view of things, that versatility of power and facility of acquirement, which such a philosophy confers on the intellect. Again, it is liberal, not useful knowledge; not but that all liberal knowledge is useful, for all good is productive of good: still, the scope of a university education is not to give just so much science as is necessary to a man for his professional pursuits,—for the law-court, the pulpit, or the field,—but to place his intellect in such an attitude with regard to truth of all kinds, that he is able to take up with success any pursuit to which he may determine to devote himself. In the ninth discourse the connexion between this state of mind and religion is pointed out; and the writer shews that its good taste and moral perception possess many advantages, though they may also lead to many evils in religion. Hence then universities, as places for the formation of the mind, have a definite ethical, religious, and intellectual character of their own; and unless the Church is present to control them, they will at first ignore, then actively oppose her. The tenth and last is partly occupied with a *résumé* of the eight preceding ones, and partly enters into a new subject—the relations of science and literature with religion.

It would not have been difficult to have given a more ample analysis of these lectures, and to have quoted many beautiful passages by way of illustration; most of our readers, however, will probably have studied the book already for themselves, and certainly we have no wish to furnish any one with an excuse for not doing so. We would rather take this opportunity, therefore, of making a few remarks on the style and method of argument which Dr. Newman has followed in these pages, and which do not, properly speaking, admit of an analysis. He does not propound a system, like the *Organon* of Aristotle, which can be studied almost with as much advantage in one of the usual compendiums as in the original book. He does not give us a treatise, like that of Euclid on geometry, commencing from axiomatic principles, and by a gradual process of deduction, leading on the mind to unexpected results. Neither, again, does he lead us by a process of induction to the acknowledgment of truths which are the precise result of the induction, neither less nor more. Mr. Brownson has somewhere said of him, that “he will seize on a particular fact, and generalise it into the basis of a universe,” and adds that his “is a purely inductive mind.” With all deference to an authority so respectable, we venture to object that such

a process would not be induction at all. A "purely inductive mind" would use "pure induction," and would never generalise further than the given instances permitted; it would never, except on hypothesis, "generalise a particular fact into the basis of a universe:" such a process is either completely unphilosophical, or it must rest on different grounds from ordinary induction or deduction. But is there any such process? Is there any method that is neither induction nor deduction? There is, as Dr. Newman shews, the method of literature, as distinguished from that of natural science, though we cannot consent to apply his rather disparaging description of that method to his own peculiarly beautiful style. "Literature," he says, (p. 361) "does not argue, but declaims and insinuates; it is multiform and versatile; it persuades instead of convincing, it seduces, it carries captive; it appeals to the sense of honour, or to the imagination, or to the stimulus of curiosity; it makes its way by means of gaiety, satire, romance, the beautiful, the pleasurable." Dr. Newman had to furnish a formula that would apply to the worst as well as the best specimens of the literary method. But they all rest on one ultimate principle; they contemplate the human soul in the concrete, as a knowing faculty guided by desire; they study these desires and wants of the soul, and seek to answer questions which the illiterate soul has not skill to put, to satisfy its dumb wishes, to put into words its vague prepossessions, and to justify its scarcely recognised presumptions. It is a skill something like that of Socrates, as described in the *Theætetus* of Plato, a kind of midwifery, by which he brings to light the ideas which were shut up in the unlettered soul. Hence the great arm of this method is the power of statement; that poetical eloquence which makes the reader feel that he has at length found the true expression of some vague misgiving, or desire, or imagination, which he had often tried in vain to apprehend; that literary style in which the language is as pellucid as glass, where the words seem to be things and the sentences thoughts, because they express only things and thoughts with which we are indistinctly familiar, so that when the expression comes to us we at once adopt it as our own. "Literature," then, "does not argue;" it insinuates by simple and luminous statement, and appeals, not to the process of induction nor to that of deduction, but to the deep-seated principles of our nature. When it is satirical, it does not use the syllogism, "that which is ridiculous is false, this is ridiculous, *ergo*," &c., but it simply ridicules, and there leaves the matter; it acts, and does not tell us the reason of its action; as knowing that if its action touches a chord of human nature, the response will be heard, though the string may not know why it vibrates.



Thus also the examples which this method uses, and in such abundance that they look like "tables of instances" collected for the purpose of a Baconian induction, are not at all what they seem—are not steps of an inductive proof, but simple "instances in illustration." Aristotle has said that "in rhetoric examples should follow, not precede the statement of principles: if they precede, the method appears to be inductive, which is not proper for rhetoric; but if they follow, they are like testimony; and the testimony of one respectable witness is enough."\* Even this, however, scarcely seems to us adequately to describe Dr. Newman's method,—rather we would use his own expressions to explain his plan. "We know," he says, "not by a direct and simple vision, not at a glance, but as it were by piecemeal and accumulation, by a mental process, by going round an object, by the comparison, the combination, the mutual correction, the continual adaptation of many partial notions, by the joint application and concentration upon it of many faculties and exercises of mind." The examples are brought forward as so many symbols of one idea. The true induction makes an abstraction of all the points of difference in the instances adduced. Dr. Newman in his method makes a synthesis of them, and composes a whole by "comparison, combination, correction, and adaptation." The two processes are radically distinct. Prove by strict induction from natural phenomena the power and being of God, and it follows, as Hume says, "that He possesses that precise degree of power, intelligence, and benevolence which appears in His workmanship, but nothing further can be proved." Take, on the other hand, these same phenomena as but symbols of a great truth, dimly though really present to our minds, namely, "the infinite power and divinity" of God, and they are, as St. Paul says, clear proofs of it; for in them this great truth is clearly seen, not by induction, but by illustration and expression.

Thus we see how this poetical and literary method can be also a religious method. St. Paul may be said to enunciate the principle almost in a proverbial form in his celebrated words to the Athenians, "what you worship in ignorance, that I preach to you"—that which you feel and know, but cannot express, I put into words for you. Dr. Newman in the sermons which he preached, while yet a Protestant, before the University of Oxford, even went so far as to found a definition of faith on a similar conception. He assumes the natural want or demand for faith, and takes this as even the evidence on which it is received. "The main evidence of

\* Rhet. ii. 20.



faith," he says, "is its desire." Again, "The word of life is offered to a man, and on its being offered he has faith in it. Why? On these two grounds,—the word of its human messenger, and the likelihood of the message. And why does he feel the message to be probable? Because he has a love for it, his love being strong, though the testimony is weak." We do not quote this as a theological verity, for we suppose that as a definition it is simply untenable, and that Dr. Newman would now express himself very differently. To us it appears to savour much more of that Puseyite exclusiveness which was aptly denominated the "gentleman heresy," which considered a man's "tone" to be all in all, and which would say with Milton, "fit audience let me find, though few," than of that Catholic spirit which addresses itself to the whole race. Puseyism addressed itself to a certain element of *religiosity* (if we may use such a term) in the soul. Where this aspiration was wanting, the Puseyite had no chance of success. The Church might "propose," but the individual would never "prove" nor approve. But the Catholic missionary addresses himself not to any one class of minds, but to all; in consequence, he does not demand any "desires" or "wants" as the foundation on which to build, but he only asks his hearers' attention.\* Let them only listen and be honest, and they will be convinced, whatever their character of mind may be, whether they have naturally a religious or an irreligious turn, whether their desires lead them to mysticism, to hard-headed science, to business, or to sensual enjoyment. We cannot, therefore, accept the description as a definition of faith, or as any thing else in religion than a method to be adopted by the missionary who "makes himself all things to all men" in addressing peculiar minds; but we accept it as an exposition of Dr. Newman's literary method, and an excellent ground for its defence. In the volume before us Dr. Newman is not addressing the multitude, but "an accomplished and philosophical audience," who all acknowledge a particular want, that of university education; he has, therefore, nothing to do but to describe to them what they want, to set it before them in words, to lead them round and round it, so as to examine every detail; and no words of ours can adequately express the beauty and perfection with which he has done this. But we must not expect more than this. The method has no similarity with the dry scholastic way of definition and deduction, which, though necessary in science, is quite out of place in literature. A

\* "All that the evidence requires is to be brought home or applied to the mind. If belief does not then follow, the fault lies with the will."—*Loss and Gain*, p. 342.

definition can never embrace the totality of anything, except of a pure intuition or production of our own minds; we can produce a triangle or a straight line in our intuition, therefore we can define it. But as we cannot produce a subsisting thing, such as a lion or a tree; so neither can we produce its perfect idea; and therefore we cannot adequately define it in the sense of describing entirely what it is, though we can define it in the sense of separating it from that which it is not. Dr. Newman has somewhere summed up this plain truth in the sentence, "It were as easy to create as to define." Definition, therefore, is of no use in the first formation of ideas, but only for the accurate use of them; ideas must be created as intuitions, before they can be defined. When a man would give us a new stock of them, he must not begin by definitions, but by descriptions: a definition is an abstraction, or dividing off of a portion; but an idea is produced by a synthesis, or a collection of constituent elements into a whole. Synthesis, therefore, must come before abstraction, poetry before philosophy, the Bible before St. Thomas. Dr. Newman furnishes the mine of ideas in which the future systematiser may quarry.

To this peculiarity of method adopted by Father Newman are to be attributed two or three characteristics of style which we will briefly notice. In the first place, the ideas are not analysed, and exposed first in their central principle, then in their details; but we are presented with a succession of views of this idea from different points, exhibited to us in examples and analogies, which are as it were variously-coloured media through which to observe it; hence, as the same idea is presented from contrary points of view, we naturally meet with seeming contradictions in its successive expositions. To take as an example the very idea of a university, which it is one main object of this book to create. In the preface we are told that it is "a place of teaching *universal knowledge*;" not for the sake of knowledge itself, but for the sake of the students, for the formation, namely, of their intellectual character. "It contemplates neither moral impression nor mechanical production; it professes to exercise neither in art nor in duty; its function is intellectual culture, and it has done its work when it has done as much as this. It educates the mind to reason well in all matters, to reach out to truth, and to grasp it" (p. 203); and it does this "by teaching *all branches* of knowledge, and in no other way." Yet again, a university is not a congeries of lecture-rooms in which the various sciences are professed, it is not a bazaar where all kinds of knowledge are exposed for sale. So far from it, Dr. Newman prefers a university which only brings together a number of young



men for three or four years and then sends them away, without any attempt at instruction, to one which exacts of its members an acquaintance with every science under the sun (p. 233). The aim of a university is not universality of knowledge, but a method and system of knowledge: a smattering in a dozen branches of study is shallowness, not enlargement of mind (p. 226); but a thorough acquisition of any one science (such as chemistry, geology, astronomy, political economy, modern history, biography, &c.) is, as far as it goes, a real education of the mind (p. 231). Hence the *universality* of the subject-matter is not necessary to the actual existence of a university, whatever it may be to its idea; for (p. 335) it is only *implicitly* that "all branches of knowledge are its subject-matter:" its object is "a formation of the mind; the preparation for knowledge, and the imparting of knowledge in proportion to that preparation" (p. 232). So that the actual amount of knowledge imparted does not seem to enter into the definition of a university; indeed, its highest aim can only be to impart *a portion* of the all-embracing philosophy (p. 218). Then again, personal influence seems more of the essence of a university than the knowledge imparted; this is Dr. Newman's reason for his preference of the do-nothing university over the universal-knowledge bazaar. Hence he illustrates what he hopes to do in a university by the example of the personal influence which St. Philip Neri obtained over the young men of his day (p. 365).

In what sense, then, is universal knowledge the subject-matter of university education? It is as that "*philosophia prima*, primitive or summary philosophy,"\* which disposes and locates all other branches of knowledge, and which, without affecting the will or moral power, nor the energy or productive power, gives to the intellect such a form as it might receive from the practice of art and of virtue; which, without giving a man the power of the craftsman or the virtue of the Christian, may give him the same intellectual gifts as these acquire by practice. It gives him intellectual knowledge both in form and in substance, and the form, without the substance, of artistic power and of moral virtues. Though it is not really practical, it appears to be so in its results. Its first work is to take the conceit out of a man, by making him aware of his own deficiencies. We might almost illustrate Father Newman's idea of education by Socrates' description of his own method.† He tells us that when the oracle pointed him out as the wisest of the Athenians, he went round to the professors of different sciences, in order

\* Bacon's Adv. of Learning, ii.

† Plat. Apol. Soc. viii. 10.



to find out how he could possibly be wiser than they; and after questioning the politicians, the poets, and the artisans, he found that "each, because he excelled in the practice of his art, thought that he was very wise in other most important matters, and this mistake of theirs obscured the wisdom that they really possessed." This attractive method soon secures that personal influence which makes a man, instead of a mere philosopher, the founder of a university. "Young men," says Socrates, "who have much leisure, and belong to the wealthiest families, following me of their own accord, take great delight in hearing men put to the test, and often imitate me, and themselves attempt to put others to the test." It is quite clear that in such a society the various branches of science are unable to usurp more than their own place, extravagant pretensions would immediately be laughed down; no Combe could exalt phrenology, nor a Broussais physiology, into the one master-science, which explained and gave the law to all others. No wonder that the ridicule with which such pretensions would be received by these young men should excite the wrath of the sophists, and set them to undermine the credit of the whole method. "Hence, those who are put to the test by them are angry with me, and not with them, and say that there is one Socrates, a most pestilent fellow, who corrupts the youth;" that is, who teaches the youth that the part is not the whole; that Arago, because he knows astronomy, or Lamartine, because he can write a romance of history, is not, therefore, infallible as a concocter of political constitutions; and that Humboldt, because he invented the science of the "geography of plants" and the isothermal lines, need not, therefore, be able to invent with the same success a new religion or a new mental philosophy. A young man brought up in such a school is not likely to assume that because he is a lawyer, therefore he understands theology; or because he is a theologian, therefore he is a competent judge of geology.

Hence it may be seen, that to form such a state of mind, not universal knowledge considered in its separate branches is requisite, but a science which considers the ground of all knowledge; a kind of geometry of the spaces occupied by the sciences, which does not do more than mark off their outlines, leaving each science to treat of its own contents or subject-matter. It is clear that a man may know exactly the limits and scope of medicine, anatomy, geology, and other sciences, without knowing any thing of the sciences themselves; for the principles on which sciences are founded do not properly belong to the sciences themselves, but to this general master-

philosophy of which we are speaking. Nay, more than this, the principles of a science, though absolutely and apodictically true for the science itself, are not therefore necessarily true in nature. The universal and necessary in each science, even in mathematics, says Aristotle (Phys. ii. c. 9), results from the hypothesis on which the science is founded. Thus physics goes on the hypothesis that the *quantum* in nature is eternal—*omnia mutantur, nil interit, et ex nihilo nil*. To deny this hypothesis is to destroy the science, which only contemplates the changes in a *given* quantum of matter; make this a variable quantity, and the possibility of physics vanishes. Now if a man gives himself up to the study of the natural sciences, it is necessary that the principle which lies at the root of all his successful experiments and consistent theories should be accepted as necessarily and universally true in itself; in making his own the highest science, he excludes all idea of a higher philosophy, in which his ultimate principle is but a subordinate one, or at best but a part of a whole. Hence he not unfrequently rejects the doctrine of creation as impossible, because it is incompatible with physical philosophy; and it is so, because the forces which physical philosophy contemplates are only mutative and motive, not creative. Hence, if physical philosophy is made universal, and not merely a part of philosophy, creation, and therefore religion, becomes simply impossible. So, again, in mathematics, the determinations of space and number are universally and necessarily true in a sense very different from that in which the objective existence of space itself is true. To deny that two and two are four is to be simply irrational; to deny the reality of space has earned for some speculators the title of philosophers. Propositions concerning the realities of things, concerning substance and the "enigma of existence," belong either to metaphysics or to revelation, "which furnishes facts to the other sciences which those sciences would never reach." What is true in the more abstract sciences is true in the more particular and partial ones. To use Dr. Newman's example, political economy teaches how to get wealth, assuming that wealth is to be got, without any of the limitations which Christianity or ethics may impose on the pursuit of wealth. Exalt political economy to a universal science, and you make money-getting the final end of religion, ethics, and politics.

But we have wandered too far from our purpose. We were shewing that Father Newman, in his process of generating an idea, is not particular about apparent contradictions: he accumulates the most varied observations in order to build up his idea, and the result would not be complete if he eliminated



all that appeared contradictory; rather he gives us the synthesis of his rich and multifarious observation, accumulated not in the order which would be observed in a scientific treatise, but in that which befits the literary method, in which Dr. Newman's own taste is an unerring judge.

Another result of the adoption of this method is the relative importance of the illustrations as compared with the statement of principles. The scientific enunciation of principles is tolerated; the illustration of them in instances and symbols is the real aim of the method, which has rather to do with intuition than with system; "system is not necessary to intuition" (p. 168). Hence "whatever is exact and systematic" displeases that attitude of mind of which St. Philip is made the representative (p. 363). System and scholastic method, when they occur, are but the casket or the frame; the illustration is the gem and the picture. Dr. Newman's, therefore, is not the method of Bacon, the aphoristic, for there "illustration and excursion, variety of examples, deduction and connection, are forbidden, and only a sufficient body of observations is allowed" (*De Aug. lib. vi. cap 2.*), though perhaps he abandons the scholastic method for much the same reason, "because

. . . 'Tantum series juncturaque pollet;'

so that a system often bears the aspect of great art, which when resolved into its elements is found to be worth nothing." Nothing tries the solidity of a man's observations so much as absence of system. How many absurd philosophies are supported only by an appearance of internal self-consistency, and when taken to pieces are found to consist of nothing but principles misunderstood and misapplied! Hence, as Bacon says, it is only when a man is conscious that he has really something to say, that he will willingly choose the unsystematic method; when he can afford to set forth his principles on their own proper strength, without giving them the adventitious support of a forced mutual connection. It is not, then, in methodical treatment that Dr. Newman's strength lies; it is, as we have said before, in statement; and yet not direct statement, but rather in illustration, in analogy, in symbol. And we may notice this peculiar beauty, that his illustrations not only bear on the point under discussion, but also settle some minor controversy. For instance, his illustrations of the possible antagonism of the fine arts—painting, sculpture, and architecture—to religion (pp. 112-117), not only set forth the kind of connection between religion and the imaginative arts, but also throw out hints which will go far in many minds towards settling the present controversies concerning the use of screens,



of Gregorian chant, and of pre-Raphaelite design. His instances of the misapplication of principles are not taken from times or subjects in which at present no interest is felt, but from just those very things which are now occupying thinking men. We feel in reading him, that we have to do with one who knows what has engaged our thoughts, and who, without professing to do so,—indeed, while professing to speak to us only on a particular subject,—is answering our doubts and speculations on most subjects of importance. He seems to absorb the learning of his times; his half-sentences, his words, his characteristic epithets serve to suggest a whole philosophy, or to confute some popular system or some well-known sophism. When he seems to be farthest from his subject, he is close to it; he grapples with it not in its naked definitions, but in its analogies, in its applications and manifestations. We could easily fancy some Callicles interrupting him, “By the gods, you never cease talking about shoemakers, fullers, cooks, and physicians, as if our discourse were about them.” But it is just these illustrations which are the symbols of the whole idea, these things are the language which must express his meaning; so that in reading Dr. Newman we have instruction on both hands; a new idea is created in us, and during the process we find that we have been receiving information on almost all the subjects of thought on which we could wish to inquire. Thus if he has to give an example of miscellaneous and aimless learning, he quietly gives a back-handed blow to the admirers of the “Standard English Divinity,” and by a delicious criticism of Jeremy Taylor (p. 222) shews the incomparable absurdity of minds of that class. If he has to illustrate the scholastic ideas of “form,” his illustration becomes a beautiful and philosophic defence of the Catholic idea of worship (p. 145). If he has to shew what literature is, his exposition becomes an unanswerable argument in favour of that secular learning which the Abbé Gaume, or at least some of his disciples, have seemed to wish to extrude from all seats of Catholic education (p. 359, 199). If he has to speak on the methods of science and religion, he takes the opportunity to correct misapprehensions of his doctrine of developments (p. 348-9). In a word, all his illustrations, even taken by themselves, are beautiful objects, and the book would be a rich mine of thoughts, even if they were unconnected; but brought as they all are under one idea, the separate gems have arranged themselves, as in the kaleidoscope, into a form of exquisite symmetry and beauty.

These two peculiarities of the literary method,—the unsystematic way in which the idea is unfolded, and the essential importance of the illustrations and subordinate parts,—consti-

tute the difficulty, or rather impossibility, of making a good analysis or abstract of this book. Such an analysis would no more represent the contents, than the argument of a book of Homer represents his poetry. In the literary method the different parts are animated by the idea, as the members of the body by the soul. Anatomy can only investigate the lifeless members, and analysis the dead formula. Dr. Newman treats a philosophical subject from the point of view of a poet,—with poetical intuition, not with scientific system.

Whether or not this is the characteristic of the highest class of writers, we care not to inquire. A man will always judge of a writer's merit by his own wants at the time: a man who wants *clear* views will naturally be drawn towards system; a man who wants information as the basis of his views will go to him who can best evoke an idea, and present it to the apprehension. As simple apprehension comes before judgment, so must sight before system.

We are very conscious that we have said but little of the book immediately before us; but we think it useful to warn our readers that they must not expect to find Dr. Newman's book any thing but what it professes to be. It consists of "discourses," it is not therefore a "treatise;" and though the details of the subject will be found to be pretty well exhausted, they do not follow on one another as the questions and articles in a scholastic treatise; the book is a whole, not mechanically, by articulation of parts, but morally, from the unity of the pervading idea which is its "form."

---

---

#### PROTESTANTISM AND CATHOLICITY COMPARED IN THEIR ACTION UPON SLAVERY.

*The Key to Uncle Tom's Cabin.* By H. B. Stowe. London,  
Clarke, Beeton, and Co.

IN our review of the book to which this is the key, we expressed our regrets that the authoress should not have adduced some historical documents or independent witnesses to vouch for the real, or at least the possible and probable, existence of the several characters and incidents which she had introduced into her tale; and at a later period—only a few days, indeed, before the appearance of this Key—we called attention to what seemed to us a very significant and regrettable omission from the same volume, viz. a sketch of the course of

action which had been pursued by Protestantism, as a religious system, towards this very important subject of slavery, and at the same time we did our best to supply the deficiency.\* The new volume that has now been issued furnishes so direct a reply both to our former and our later article, that it would be dishonest in us not to notice it; and, indeed, we are not sorry on other accounts to have an opportunity of recurring to the subject. With regard to the first point—the authority for the several incidents of her tale—the title-page of the present work distinctly promises to lay before us “the original facts and documents upon which the story is founded, together with corroborative statements verifying the truth of the whole;” and with regard to the second—the course of action that has been pursued by Protestants, or by the “American Church,” as Mrs. Stowe would fain have us call them,—this forms the main subject of the fourth and last part of the book, and is honestly told. We have a few words to say upon both these points; for whilst slavery continues to occupy so prominent a position, and to engross so much of the public attention, it is very desirable that Catholics should be both fully informed, and have their views upon the subject accurately defined.

First, then, whilst we are bound to acknowledge that the authoress has satisfactorily established the possible, nay the actual truth of the greater portion of her work, she has not at all removed our objections to it considered with reference to its avowed object, as an instrument of religious and political propagandism. She has proved that slavery, as it actually exists in the United States and as it is defined and sanctioned by American laws, is a monstrous and a brutal thing, a disgrace to any nation calling itself Christian; but she has *not* shewn—what the most clamorous of her admirers on both sides of the Atlantic would fain insist upon—that the immediate and total abolition of “the institution” would be the best and wisest remedy for the evil. She confounds, as we said at the first, slavery itself with a particular form of slavery, the institution itself with its worst abuses; and this faulty process of logic, which in a mere work of fiction would not be worth noticing, becomes frightfully important, and prolific of the most disastrous consequences, when, as in the present instance, it becomes generally adopted, and is sought to be made the foundation of practical measures in religion and politics. It is a work of charity, therefore, to expose it. Mrs. Stowe considers that all the evils which she has so graphically described and so artistically combined in *Uncle Tom's Cabin*—the destruction of family ties, the condemnation of a whole

\* See *Rambler* for November 1852 and April 1853.



class of human beings to a state of concubinage, the brutal mutilation or murder of men and women with impunity,—that these and their kindred miseries are necessary and inseparable accidents of slavery; not, of course, in the case of every individual slaveholder,—for she freely acknowledges that many will be restrained through the influence of the principles of humanity and religion,—but on the whole, in a greater or less degree, in every slaveholding community or country. This is not the error of Mrs. Stowe only; it is the deliberate assertion of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, to which Mrs. Stowe belongs. In their declaration on the subject of slavery in 1818 occurs the following passage:

“Slavery creates a paradox in the moral system; it exhibits rational, accountable, and immortal beings in such circumstances as scarcely to leave them the power of moral action. It exhibits them as dependent on the will of others, whether they shall receive religious instruction; whether they shall know and worship the true God; whether they shall enjoy the ordinances of the gospel; whether they shall perform the duties and cherish the endearments of husbands and wives, parents and children, neighbours and friends; whether they shall preserve their chastity and purity, or regard the dictates of justice and humanity. Such are some of the consequences of slavery; *consequences not imaginary, but which connect themselves with its very existence.*”

Now if this were indeed really true, if this awful category of evils were really and necessarily the strict natural consequence of slavery wherever it existed, no Christian man could conscientiously bear a part in it under any circumstances or in any form whatever. It would be an institution simply diabolical in its nature, and to be resisted every where and at all costs, even, if it were necessary, at the risk of life. A Christian and an Abolitionist would be convertible terms; or at least a Christian slaveholder would be an utter impossibility. The juxtaposition of those two words would involve a self-evident absurdity, as great as to speak of a Christian Pagan or a Christian Mahometan. And no doubt there are some persons who really believe this; some persons who are so confident in the soundness of their views on the natural rights of man, and of their interpretation of certain texts in the Bible, that they would not scruple to maintain the extravagant conclusion which we have drawn, even though it should involve the un-Christianising of the whole Church of God during the first ten or twelve centuries of the Christian era. Catholics, however, if only they are true to their own principles and to the history of their forefathers, and do not allow themselves to be carried away by a blind subjection to the only recognised

teacher of the nineteenth century—public opinion—are in no danger of falling into such excesses. They know that this was not the doctrine preached by the Apostles, nor the principle of that gentle persevering course of action so steadily pursued by the Church in each succeeding age in her warfare against slavery, and which was at last so eminently successful. What that doctrine and principle was, will best appear by tracing some of its developments in history, contrasting them, as we go along, with the developments of the Protestant principle.

The history of the action of nearly all the Protestant bodies in this matter, as recorded by Mrs. Stowe, may be accurately summed up in a very few words. They began by denouncing slavery as one of the most accursed evils on the face of the earth, and all slave-holding as absolutely and necessarily sinful, "wholly opposed to the law of God, and totally irreconcilable with the precepts of the gospel of Christ;" and at the end of about sixty years they have come to the conclusion that slave-holding is no sin at all, that it is "a mere question of political economy, with which ecclesiastical judicatories have not the smallest right to interfere;" nay more, that slavery is "not even a moral evil," but rather "a blessing both to master and slave." "If we look over the history of all denominations," says Mrs. Stowe, "we shall see that the anti-slavery testimony has every year grown weaker and weaker." The Presbyterian Assembly, which in 1793 declared slave-holding to be the highest kind of theft, in 1816 expunged that declaration, and in 1836 resolves "that it is not expedient for the Assembly to take any further order in relation to this subject." The Methodist Conference, which in 1780 resolved that "slavery was contrary to the laws of God, man, and nature, and to the dictates of conscience and true religion," and which in 1784 excluded from "the Lord's supper" all slave-buyers, sellers, or holders, in 1836 resolves that "they are decidedly opposed to modern abolitionism, and wholly disclaim any right, *wish*, or *intention* to interfere in the civil and political relation between master and slave;" in the same year they refuse also to publish an address from their brethren in England affectionately remonstrating on the subject of slavery, and further resolve, that "no one shall be elected a deacon or elder in the Church, unless he will give a pledge to the Church that he will refrain from discussing this subject;" that is, from discussing a subject which but fifty years before they considered the very test of practical Christianity.

Surely never was the impotency and absurdity of Protestantism as a rule and guide for men's souls in moral action more strikingly exhibited than in these melancholy histories.



Let us compare with them, for a moment, the course pursued by the ancient Church. That Church began with enforcing in every possible way the apostolic precept, "Slaves, be obedient to them that are your lords according to the flesh," "be subject to your masters with all fear," &c. &c.; yet in the end the fruit which it bore was universal emancipation. One of the very earliest acts of ecclesiastical legislation on this subject of which we have any record, was a canon of the Council of Gangres, A.D. 324, excommunicating those who, under pretence of piety, taught that slaves ought to quit their masters and withdraw from their service; yet, before the period of the Reformation, Christian and Catholic Europe was delivered from slavery. Scarcely had Christianity been introduced into Ireland, than a decree was passed (in the council commonly known by the name of the Synod of St. Patrick, A.D. 450), declaring that the clergy must not teach slaves to run away from their masters, but if they wish to set them free, they must pay their value and redeem them honestly out of bondage; yet seven or eight hundred years afterwards, in the Council of Armagh, A.D. 1172, the whole body of the Irish clergy assembled together decree that all Englishmen who are detained as slaves in any part of the country should immediately be set free. The dates of these decrees are not fortuitous; it would not have been possible to reverse their chronological order, and yet to reap the same fruit from them: the decree of the Council of Armagh introduced into the beginning of the fifth century, might have hindered the conversion of Ireland; it might have given rise to civil commotions, conspiracies, and rebellions, but it certainly would not have issued in the total and peaceable abolition of slavery at the end of the twelfth century. American Protestantism would fain reverse the process, and we have seen how abortive are the results.

The American Anti-Slavery Society sets forth in its own programme the following ends as the objects of its labours, and it sets them forth in the following order: "1st, the immediate abolition of slavery throughout the United States; 2d, as a necessary consequence, the suppression of the American slave-trade; 3d, the ultimate elevation of the black population to an equality with the white in civil and religious privileges." Read this programme backwards, and we have a far nearer approach to the order and succession of events which true prudence would recommend, and which the heavenly-guided wisdom of the Church has actually pursued. The Church, in all her contests with evil, aims at a real, not a merely nominal victory; she desires a radical cure, and would not willingly be a party to any process which should only re-



move the evil out of sight. Thus, the name of slavery has disappeared from the northern portion of the United States; nay, its essence too has been withdrawn in so far as that essence consists in the compulsory and unrequited labour of the slave; but its worst and bitterest ingredient, that which is most essentially anti-Christian in it, still remains,—contempt of the servile race, disdain, and humiliation. Emancipation such as this is no work of the Church; she would not care to have it made universal through the whole length and breadth of the world to-morrow, even if she had the power. Her work goes far deeper; she begins at the very foundation. What the American programme puts last, and calls “the ultimate elevation of the black population to an equality with the white in civil and religious privileges,” is what the Church would aim at first. Equality in *religious* privileges, being wholly in her own power, she *does* give to the poor slave absolutely and at once; she did so in days of old throughout the dominion of Pagan Rome, and she does so now throughout Protestant America. It is impossible to take up any work treating on the subject of slavery in that country, or any respectable journal even of the most bigoted traveller passing through it, without finding this fact broadly and distinctly acknowledged, that in all that concerns religion the Church of Rome treats freemen and slaves, black men and white, on a perfect equality, and that she is the only religious body which does so. We will not load our pages with quotations to prove a fact about which there is no dispute. And then as to *civil* rights and privileges, these, indeed, in America, it is not in her power to bestow; but wherever her influence has been of any real weight in the disposal of such matters, it has been uniformly exerted in this direction, and with a view to this final result. Witness the canons of her earliest councils upon this matter; they were aimed almost exclusively at obtaining for the unfortunate and oppressed servile class a practical recognition of equality in the eyes of the law, so far at least as to secure to them its powerful protection—to shield them from all wanton injury and violence from the hands of their masters, and to substitute right for might in the code which regulated their treatment. Witness the slave-laws at the present day in any Catholic countries, and compare them with those which disgraced the statute-book of the British West Indies but a few years since, and those which disgrace the American statute-book even now. In the British colony of Bermuda, for instance, an act was passed in 1730 with reference to the killing of slaves either by excessive correction or by wilful murder; and the preamble of this act recited, that whereas “slaves, for brutishness of

their nature, be no otherwise valued or esteemed amongst us than as our goods and chattels or other personal estates," *therefore*, it goes on to enact, "if a master should happen to kill a slave in the process of correcting him, he shall not be liable to any imprisonment, fine, penalty, or forfeiture whatever; but if he should do it wilfully and maliciously (in other words, should he be guilty of wilful murder), he shall pay a fine of 10*l.* into his majesty's treasury." The *principle* of this most atrocious act is neither more nor less than the old Pagan theory about slaves, whereby they were considered to be not persons but things; and it is stated in the most undisguised manner in the law-books of South Carolina at the present moment, in the following words: "Slaves shall be deemed, sold, taken, reputed, and adjudged in law to be chattels personal in the hands of their owners and possessors, *to all intents, constructions, and purposes whatsoever.*" We will not stop to inquire what variations of practice in the application of this principle may be tolerated according to the different laws of the various States of the Union; we must refer those of our readers who are curious in such matters to the pages of Mrs. Stowe herself. It is enough for us to know, as a sample of the spirit that pervades the whole system, that it has been decided in an American court of justice, that a master can bring no action for an assault and battery committed upon his slave by a stranger, *unless the injury be such as to produce a loss of service* (p. 135); that it has been decided, with equal precision, that the owner or hirer of a slave cannot be indicted for the malicious, cruel, and excessive beating of that slave, provided only that it do not destroy life (p. 151); that the right of the master cannot be brought into discussion in the courts of justice; that his power must be absolute, to render the submission of the slave perfect; that the slave, to remain a slave, must be made sensible that there is *no appeal from his master*, for that the master's power is in no instance usurped, but is conferred by the laws of man at least, if not by the law of God (p. 146). It is enough, we say, that we should quote grave judicial decisions like these, and then set by their side the corresponding laws of a Catholic country tolerating slavery. The following extracts are taken from a royal ordinance for the government and protection of slaves in the Spanish colonies, issued by the king of that country in 1789, and ordered to be printed by our own House of Commons on May 31, 1811:—

"A master or his steward may punish his slaves for neglect of duty, according to the nature of their offence, with prison, chains, or lashes, *which must not exceed the number of twenty-five, and those must be given in such a manner as not to cause any contusion or effu-*



*sion of blood.*" [In the American code the sentence runs thus, "thirty-nine lashes well laid on the bare back;" and for the meaning of this when carried into practice, see the testimony of Dr. Howe in the *Key*, p. 60.] "If a slave commits a crime which requires greater punishments than these, a lawsuit shall be commenced against him in the audience of the slave's master, *and of the attorney who defends the cause of the former*, and a punishment imposed upon him according to the importance and circumstances of the offence; *observing in every thing what is ordered by the laws with respect to the causes of other delinquents in general.*" [In Virginia there are no less than seventy-one offences punishable by death if committed by slaves, by imprisonment only if committed by freemen; and generally throughout the United States, punishments of much greater severity are inflicted upon slaves than upon freemen for the same offences (p. 144)]. "If a master or his steward is guilty of excess in punishing the slaves, causing them contusion, effusion of blood, or mutilation of members, besides paying a fine of fifty, one hundred, or two hundred dollars, according to the nature of the offence, he shall be prosecuted as a criminal, and have a punishment inflicted upon him according to the crime which he has committed; *and the slave shall be confiscated and sold to another master*, and his price shall be put into the fine-chest, &c. No other person who is not their master, or his steward, shall injure, chastise, wound, or kill a slave, *without incurring the punishment enacted by the laws against those who commit the like excesses towards free people*; and the master of the slave who has been injured, chastised, or killed, shall commence a lawsuit against the criminal, and the attorney, as protector of slaves, shall defend his cause."

Need we quote more from this Royal Cedula to prove the truth of what we asserted, viz. that in any country where the Church has real power and influence, she does her best to provide for the servile class, that they shall at least enjoy equal protection from the laws, even though it be impossible that they should be admitted to an equality of political rights and privileges? Neither can it be necessary that we should specifically mention that she provides also for every thing that concerns their physical, moral, and religious well-being. This very ordinance from which we have already quoted contains provisions for the food and clothing of the slaves, that it should be "the same as the work-people who are free have;" for their occupation, that none should be forced to work who were more than sixty years old or younger than seventeen, and that all should be allowed "two hours a day to themselves, to be employed in manufactures or occupations for their own advantage;" for their habitations, that "they must be commodious, with beds, blankets, and every thing necessary, and that each man shall have his own bed, and there shall be no more than



two in a room ;” for their marriages, that they are “to be encouraged,” and that marriages between the slaves of different masters are not to be hindered, but that the master of the husband shall buy the wife at a fair valuation, that so the object of marriage may be fulfilled; or if he refuse to do so, the master of the wife shall buy the husband; and above all, for their religious education, that “the owners of the estate shall be at the expense of maintaining a priest to say Mass for them, and to explain to them the Christian doctrine, as likewise to administer the Holy Sacraments; and that every day, as soon as their work is finished, they shall say the rosary together with the greatest composure and devotion.” We have been more particular than we otherwise should have been in quoting at length from this Spanish document, because Mrs. Stowe, when wishing to dilate upon the extreme severity of the American law of slavery, says, “She has not at hand the means of comparing French and Spanish slave-codes,” and proceeds, therefore, to compare the American with the ancient Roman law; a comparison, the result of which, we may mention by the way, is on the whole decidedly in favour of the Pagan over the Protestant legislation. We regret extremely that she should not have been more successful in her attempts to become acquainted with the slave-codes of the countries she has named, and cannot help feeling a shrewd suspicion that she was not extravagantly diligent in her search, for we observe elsewhere in the course of her work very significant indications of a general knowledge that those codes are very superior to that of her own country; as, for instance, in a note to page 134, where she says, that “owing to the influence of the French code in the State of Louisiana, many really humane provisions prevail there;” and a few pages further on she even attempts to account for the greater humanity of the French and Spanish codes by referring it to the natural constitution of those people being “more impulsive, passionate, and poetic,” whilst “the Anglo-Saxon race are more coldly and strictly logical, and have an unflinching courage to meet the consequences of every premise which they lay down.” Now this is precisely what the Anglo-Saxon race are *not* specially remarkable for; it is not their ordinary characteristic to follow to their extreme but legitimate results all the principles which they profess; otherwise we should not have had so many imperfect, half-developed phases of Protestantism in this country, but the reformed faith would have run here the same course as it has in Germany, and would be already merged in the abyss of infidelity. No; the true cause of the difference between Spanish and American slave-laws is to be sought elsewhere. There has been an element at

work in the council-chambers of French and Spanish legislatures which has tempered the natural cruelties of slavery, and introduced into the laws that regulate it the same wise and humane provisions which were introduced by Christianity at the first into the slave-code of Pagan Rome, and whose ultimate and natural fruit is liberty; and this element was both wanting to the British legislature of the West Indies as long as slavery was established there, and is wanting to the American legislature of the present day; we mean, of course, the important element of the influence of the Catholic Church. Had this influence been stronger than it was, had the French and Spanish governments been always faithful and obedient servants of the Church, slavery would never have been reproduced in the New World after its final abolition in the Old: Rome raised her warning voice, but she was not attended to; the greedy thirst after gain so hardened men's hearts that they refused to listen to her decrees, and slavery was re-established. And as time went on, and the mightiest nations of the earth, both Protestant and Catholic, became more and more deeply engaged in the detestable traffic, Rome still did not keep silence. At the very time when Protestant England had entered into a treaty with Catholic Spain, whereby our country secured to itself the exclusive right of carrying on the slave-trade to La Plata, and engaged to transport to the Spanish Indies, for a period of 30 years, 4800 slaves a-year at a certain duty per head,—at that very time the voice of “a feeble old man at Rome,” Pope Benedict XIV., was raised in indignant remonstrances addressed to the bishops in Brazil and other countries which it concerned, calling upon them to use their utmost exertions to check the evil. And this was done, not from any special degree of humanity belonging to Pope Benedict himself as an individual; he was only continuing the same earnest testimony that had been already given by his illustrious predecessors, Urban VIII. in 1639, Paul III. in 1573, and Pius II. in 1482. The see of Rome was ever faithful to her duties as the appointed guardian of morals and religion; she never ceased to lift up her voice on behalf of oppressed humanity, and to inculcate those lessons of mercy, liberality, and enlightenment for which the nineteenth century would fain take such credit to itself. But she shone as a light in a dark place; the public mind, even in Catholic countries, was no longer possessed with that spirit of religion and dutiful obedience to the Vicar of Christ, which had been the safeguard and bulwark of European society during the “dark” ages; and the enslaving of the poor negroes was persevered in, spite of the denunciations of Rome. Yet



though the Church of Rome could not effect all that she desired, her efforts were not on that account altogether thrown away. It was true she could not prevent the evil seed from being sown in the New World; but wherever, and exactly in proportion as, her influence extended, she *could* and she *did* prevent the noisome plant from bringing forth the same hateful fruits that it had borne in unregenerate Heathendom, and that it has borne again in the congenial soil of Protestantism. Every one acknowledges that even the Code Noir of France is a great improvement on that of the British West Indies or of the United States; but in Spain and Portugal, those countries in which the influence of the Church has been so much stronger, and which are on that account upbraided by our fellow-countrymen as bigoted, ignorant, and superstitious, and are seldom or never spoken of without these qualifying epithets,—there, as we have seen, the laws which regulate slavery are lenity personified; and not only do they secure every thing that *can* be secured for the well-being of the slaves *as long as they remain slaves*, but also they have a very strong and unmistakeable tendency towards abolishing the institution altogether. Our limits will not allow us to enumerate here the several enactments which were introduced into the Spanish slave-code for the express purpose of encouraging emancipation;\* it is enough to refer to the testimony of modern Protestant travellers of intelligence and honesty, who distinctly acknowledge that “slavery in those countries is fast approaching to its end; and if the African slave-trade be once totally abolished, before the expiration of half a century there will not a slave be found in either Spanish or Portuguese America.”† Moreover, one fact at least speaks for itself, viz. that the Popish “semi-barbarous” Mexicans, as the Americans delighted to call them, actually had driven out slavery altogether from their dominions, before the war with America re-introduced it, and with it Protestantism.

But to return more directly to our argument, from which we have been insensibly digressing. We have said that the course of action which Mrs. Stowe and the American abolitionists generally have marked out for themselves begins precisely where it should end, and that the whole process would be materially improved by being read backwards; and we have shewn the truth of this observation with reference to their third and last object, the raising of the servile class to an equality

\* The reader will find much interesting information on this subject in *Slavery of the British West India Colonies delineated*, by J. Stephen, Esq : London, 1824, pp. 376, 382. See also Appendix (No. V.) to Granville Sharpe’s *Just Limitation of Slavery*, 1776.

† See *White Slave*, ch. xxxvi.



of civil and religious privileges with freemen; a step which the Church aims at bringing about *first*, as far as the circumstances of each case render at all practicable, being well assured that when once she has established a fellowship between slaves and their masters in Christian charity, it will not be difficult to unite them in the fellowship of social and political freedom. With regard to the two other propositions, it cannot be necessary to waste many words on proving that here also our Transatlantic friends have strangely inverted the natural order of things; they propose first "to effect the immediate abolition of slavery throughout the United States, and then, as a necessary consequence, to suppress the American slave-trade." Rather suppress the American slave-trade, and by and by you will have, as a sure and necessary consequence, the cessation of slavery throughout the States. And such was the judgment and the practice of the Church in the early ages: she did not denounce slave-holding as a sin which should subject her children to excommunication or to ecclesiastical censures of any kind, nor did she clamour for the instant emancipation of slaves; but she checked the slave-trade, by imposing certain restrictions upon it, distinguishing slaves from other kinds of property with which they had been hitherto confounded, and from which, we may add, they are in no wise distinguished in Protestant America even at the present day. The advertisement-columns of the journals of that enlightened country exhibit negroes for sale, "tumbled promiscuously out before the public," says Mrs. Stowe, "with horses, mules, second-hand buggies, cotton-seed, bedsteads," &c.; and they are sold precisely on the same principles as any other piece of property or article of furniture that a man may wish to get rid of, viz. to the highest bidder. The ancient councils of the Church, on the other hand, fulminated the most severe anathemas against those Christians who should dare to sell their slaves into the hands of Jews or other enemies of the Christian faith: "by the ninth canon of the Council of Chalons, held in 650, it was forbidden," says Balmez, "to sell slaves out of the kingdom of Clovis, lest they should fall into the power of Jews or Pagans;" other canons went still further, and prohibited slaves who were the property of the Church from ever being sold at all; they were to be considered as dedicated to God, and though they might be set at liberty, and every facility and encouragement was given for this purpose, it was not allowed to sell them into the hands of other masters. "This limit to the power of sale was a great step," observes the same judicious author, "towards declaring open war against the property in slaves itself, and abolishing it by all legitimate means." The modern Church

follows faithfully in the same prudent and merciful course. Without condemning all holding of men in slavery as in itself necessarily sinful, she distinctly denounces the *traffic* in these unfortunate beings, "the buying and selling of the blacks as though they were mere impure animals," as a scandalous crime; she visits with the most severe censures all those who reduce them into servitude, who strip them of their property, separate them from their wives and children, neglect their education, or cruelly ill-treat them; and thus, whilst seeming only to prohibit the excesses and abuses of the system, she does in effect strike a really fatal blow at the root of the whole matter; so that sooner or later, wherever her influence is acknowledged, it must needs come to an end. It would be a blessed thing indeed for the three millions of slaves in America, if the apostolic letters of the 3d of November, 1839, of Pope Gregory XVI., could become part and parcel of the law of the land; nay, something far short of this, the decrees and canons of the earliest provincial councils which legislated on this subject at all, would bring about an unspeakable amelioration of their condition. Mrs. Stowe would then no longer have to tell of "thousands of her fellow-creatures writhing under the lash, *often inflicted by ministers and elders of the Presbyterian Church*" (p. 413); of a Presbyterian elder whipping his own slaves "with a cow-hide until the blood dripped from their backs," "rebuking" his son for sympathising with the unfortunate sufferers, teaching, assisting, and encouraging that son to whip them himself, and finally separating a husband and wife by the sale of the former amid "a heart-rending scene" (p. 23); of another elder of the same church refusing to sell a girl to her own mother, and choosing rather to send her away to the southern market (p. 236); of a third minister of the same Christian community knowingly selling a married woman to one who coveted her, that he might make her lead a life of sin (p. 304); in a word, of all those frightful enormities committed by Baptists, Methodists, or Presbyterian ministers, which make her last work so painful yet so instructive a study.

And this brings us to a consideration of the other point on which we were anxious to say a few words, viz. the course of action that has been pursued upon this whole question of slavery by the legislative powers of the various sects of Protestantism. We have already given a brief but sufficient sketch of the general character of their proceedings, both in the present and in a former article, and we will not repeat it here, especially since it may be found very fully and honestly exposed by Mrs. Stowe in the fourth part of her Key. One word, however, we may be allowed to add as to the *cause* of

the melancholy weakness which this history exhibits in the Protestant mode of dealing with an evil which once they so pathetically lamented or so vehemently denounced. Whence comes this perpetual oscillation of opinions, or rather this steady deterioration both of theory and of practice, with regard to so growing an evil? The true secret of this weakness is to be found where Mrs. Stowe and her co-religionists are least inclined to look for it,—in the fundamental theory of Protestantism, that the Bible and the Bible only is the rule of faith. It is not an uncommon thing in Protestant controversy to hear men boasting of this rule as something specially firm and inflexible, that cannot be bribed, cannot be affected in any way by the manners and customs of any particular age or country, but must necessarily remain fixed and unalterable, always the same, and always supreme over every thing; yet all the while we see them making it in practice a very rule of Lesbos, a rule that gives and bends in their hands, and accommodates itself to every whim and caprice and idle fashion of the hour. The very same people who but a short time since, when slavery was generally unpopular in the United States and thought to be on the decline, saw clearly that it was contrary to conscience and forbidden by God's Word, now quote with complacency the example of "those good old slaveholders and patriarchs, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, who are in the kingdom of heaven," and pass a formal decree, declaring that "without a new revelation, no man is entitled to pronounce slavery wrong." Some few, however, belonging to the same denomination remain faithful to the language of their earlier formularies, and still maintain that slave-holding is "in every instance wrong, unrighteous, and oppressive," and clearly condemned by God's law. How is the controversy to be settled? Both parties appeal to the Bible; but the Bible has no living voice, and cannot speak; the true sense to be put upon its written words is the very question at issue; the dispute, therefore, can never be ended thus. The real good that might be done by the combination of many zealous men, acting upon mistaken principles perhaps, yet working together towards the same benevolent end, is lost amid the din of sectarian strife; and meanwhile the poor unhappy slaves are abandoned to a life of degradation and of misery in this world, without being prepared or instructed for the attainment of everlasting happiness in another. And this is not all; the testimony of the protesting party, of those who disapprove of slavery and would fain do their best to abolish it, grows every day weaker and weaker; and the reason is obvious. The party which is interested in the support of slavery is a very



strong party; "it is confessedly the dominant power of the nation;" lust, cupidity, and every evil passion is enlisted on its side; it is emphatically the power of *the world*; and we know but of one power which is greater than the world, to whom it is given "to overcome the world," and that power is *not* Protestantism. Mrs. Stowe herself acknowledges this with the utmost simplicity: "The decision," she says, "has always gone in this way; the slave-power *will* not concede—we *must*." And again, Dr. Wilberforce, Protestant Bishop of Oxford, says virtually the same thing. After relating the history of Dr. Onderdonk, Protestant Bishop of New York, who refused to admit into the General Theological Seminary a young candidate for holy orders, otherwise perfectly eligible, on the score of his "identity with the people of colour," and who confessed to the young man himself, whom he was thus unjustly depriving of certain advantages to which he was both morally and legally entitled, that he was "yielding to the *unrighteous prejudice* of the community,"—Bishop Wilberforce goes on to say, "The Episcopalian body in America plainly has not been conscious of possessing power to stand up in God's name and to rebuke the evil one:"\* he would have spoken still more correctly, if he had said that "plainly they *have* been conscious of *not* possessing" any such power. It is precisely the same with all the denominations. Ask a Baptist minister at New Orleans why he makes no attempt to interfere in improving the existing relations between masters and slaves, and his answer is prompt and candid,—“It would render us and our churches *unpopular*, and thereby destroy our usefulness.”† The Unitarian Parker reveals the whole truth by the use of the same word: "Most of the churches in the United States," he says, "exercise the power of excluding a man from their communion for such offences as they see fit, for any *unpopular* breach of the moral law."‡ Popularity and unpopularity, these are the real touchstones, the Protestant tests of right and wrong, the secret springs of Protestant ecclesiastical discipline. Protestant ministers do not claim to have any real supernatural authority to expound the law of God and to enforce its observance, and nobody dreams of conceding it to them; they are, as some wit has cleverly described them; "respectable gentlemen, dressed in black, who get into the pulpit every Sunday to say reasonable things;" reasonable or unreasonable, as the case may be, and the congregation is

\* History of the Church in America, p. 430.

† See American Scenes and Christian Slavery, by E. Davies, p. 72. London, 1849.

‡ Letter to the People of the United States, p. 71. Boston, 1848.

the judge of this; and if they say what is very offensive to men's pride, very injurious to their pockets, or very inconvenient in its interference with their social and political habits, they are apt to decide that it is very unreasonable; the remedy is easy, and they are not slow to avail themselves of it; "they withdraw from the preacher," says Mrs. Stowe, "and choose another."

This, then, is one great secret of the retrograde course of Protestant action in the matter of slavery, viz. the absence of any living authority to declare with infallible certainty the law of God concerning the questions at issue; and another thing closely connected with this, and scarcely less important, is the absence of any direct and intimate communication in the Protestant system between the conscience of the individual and the authority of God's minister, so as to secure obedience to the law once expounded. It is true indeed that some, if not all, of the Protestant sects have, in theory at least, retained or revived the form of *excommunicating* grievous offenders; but in the first place, it is obvious that the very essence of Protestantism deprives that last and mightiest weapon of the Church of all its terrors. An excommunication which is not endorsed by the dogma, *Extra ecclesiam nulla salus*, is a mere *brutum fulmen*. It would be really ludicrous, if the subject were less solemn and the interests at stake something less valuable than immortal souls, to see the way in which the puny arms of some Protestant sect attempt to wield this terrible and trenchant weapon of the Church Catholic. One of the American pamphlets lying before us presents us with two specimens, one only more ridiculous than the other. The first, dated Salem, October 14, 1842, is addressed to a Miss Maria French, and signed by Brown Emerson and Jacob Hood, *Committee (!)*; and warns the said Miss French that "excision from a church of Christ is a distressing and awful event," since every one who is "*justly* cut off from a true church of Christ and does not return, is given up of Him to a reprobate mind." The second, dated from Boston, June 1, 1840, and signed by N. Adams, Pastor of Essex Street Church, hints still more explicitly at what appears to be the ordinary remedy of excommunicated persons among Protestants, namely, to pass over to "*another church*." "It is my painful duty," writes Mr. Adams, "as pastor, to send you the above vote. Now if you are, in the sight of Christ, an excommunicated person, *no sympathy or protection which any professed church of Christ can afford you* will lessen your guilt or restore you to membership in the Saviour's body. If we have done according to the mind of Christ in this matter, whatsoever is

loosed" (surely the pastor meant to have said *bound*) "on earth shall be loosed in heaven." Can any thing be more melancholy than this mockery of the most solemn practice of the Church? and can any thing be more puerile and powerless as a means of discipline? But in the second place, even supposing this remedy of excommunication were as efficient among Protestants as it is manifestly worthless, still is there not wanting some more gentle, more ordinary mode of bringing men's conduct into conformity with those rules and principles of action which the Church may have prescribed to them? Mrs. Stowe, indeed, seems to think so lightly of excommunication, that she gravely represents it to us as the duty of "a generous Christian man" to encourage the authorities of whatever denomination he may happen to belong to, to inflict this punishment upon all slave-holders, even though he knows with certainty concerning himself, that, either from pecuniary embarrassments or some other cause, he must needs continue to be a slave-holder.

"Should not a generous Christian man say," asks Mrs. S., "if church excision will stop this terrible evil, let it come, though it does bear hardly upon me? Better that I suffer a little injustice than that this horrible injustice be still credited to the account of Christ's Church. Shall I embarrass the whole Church with my embarrassments? What if I am careful and humane in my treatment of my slaves? what if in my heart I have repudiated the wicked doctrine that they are my property, and am treating them as my brethren? what am I then doing? All the credit of my example goes to give force to the system. The Church ought to reprove this fearful injustice, and reprovers ought to have clean hands; and if I cannot really get clear of this, *I had better keep out of the Church till I can*" (p. 422).

Others, however, it is to be presumed, having a juster notion of what excommunication really means, and of the consequences which it entails *when it means any thing and has any consequence at all*, must surely look upon it as an extreme remedy, and one that is not lightly to be made use of; and thoughtful and sensible persons, if such there be among the Protestants of America, must surely feel the want of some more gentle and private, yet powerful instrument, whereby the admonitions and practical decisions of their Church may be made to penetrate into the inmost soul of the people, and dutiful obedience to them be enforced; in a word, such an instrument as is provided by Catholics in the tribunal of penance.

There are many other points in Mrs. Stowe's book on



which we should have liked to make some observations; for the present, however, we must forbear, and will only, in conclusion, beg our readers to turn over in their minds the opposite side of the picture which we have now laid before them, and to observe how, humanly speaking, the secret of the Church's strength and unflinching firmness in all her struggles with evil is to be found in the double root of the hierarchy and the confessional. The Christian priesthood and episcopacy, with the Pope at their head, proclaiming publicly with a voice of authority what is the law of God, and then the same priesthood privately in the tribunal of penance bringing home that law to every man's conscience, and trying their work by it; these two—the one a more than human legislator, the other a gentle yet most efficient executor of the law—are able to accomplish, by God's blessing, without violence, without injustice, and with the most complete success, social reforms and revolutions of the utmost magnitude; reforms of which Protestantism too is very conscious of the need, which it blindly attempts to compass, but through its impotency and its ignorance only succeeds in rendering every day more and more difficult.

---

---

#### CATHOLIC TALES AND NARRATIVES.

*Joe Baker; or, the One Church.* Burns and Lambert.

*James Jordan; or, the Treasure and its Price.* Dolman.

JOE BAKER has the honour of commencing a new series of the *Clifton Tracts*; and from the excellence of the beginning we augur well for what is to follow. Those of our readers who have already enjoyed the agreeable acquaintance of *James Jordan*, will not fail to derive equal pleasure from an introduction to *Joe Baker*; for between the two it is not difficult to detect a decided family resemblance. Both are honest right-minded Englishmen, in whom a somewhat rough-grained disposition, incident to their birth and education, is tempered with a native goodness which is singularly characteristic of many thousands of the same class at this moment in our England.

Joe Baker follows the trade denoted by his name; his origin is thus graphically told by himself:

“ I never knew my parents; I can only guess that I am about fifty years of age; and when, how, or by whom my name of Joseph

was given to me I cannot tell. The first thing I recollect is being one of many small children, clad in a canvas garment, allowed to play in a yard, and fed on oatmeal, bread, and potatoes. It was said that we *belonged to the parish*. I have nothing to say of kindness or unkindness; we belonged to the parish, and, as such, were treated as little animals, and were kept alive. We never learnt any thing; and as I have since found out that I am able to learn, I can only suppose that we were never taught any thing" (p. 1).

About ten years of age he is taken off the hands of the parish by a baker, in whose establishment he is turned to account in every possible way; he has plenty to eat, and his full share of hard words and hard blows; but he grows fast, becomes strong, hearty, and merry; and moreover, for the first time in his life, gets a surname—the neighbours call him Joe Baker. His "first friend" is charmingly described, with much of the same true nervous pathos which went straight to our hearts in *James Jordan*. By degrees young Baker recommends himself to his master, who has him taught reading, writing, and ciphering; so that when he reaches the age of twenty-one, he is one of the most promising young men in the parish. Religion does not trouble his thoughts much, except that a general regard to decency of behaviour is considered by himself and his master as a necessary requisite to success in their trade.

"At last, one day my poor old mistress died. She went out of life, as she sat in her chair, just as you would blow out a candle, it seemed; and nobody cared more about it. Master drank more spirits and water, and took it stronger, and was in a hurry to get the dead out of the house. I too was glad to have the funeral over; for I had always carried myself 'above religion,' always treated it as an unmanly thing, fit for women and children only; and I found the corpse a very uncomfortable sight. Where was the old woman? That senseless flesh *was* her, and yet it *wasn't* her. Sometimes I started in my work, almost thinking she might be by my side, come back to tell me something; for I still felt that man was better than the beasts, and that there was that in him which would never die.

"Sometimes people came in to see the corpse; sometimes they made remarks. One said, 'that she had lived and died without God; that she had worshipped nothing but money; that 'twas an awful sight to see the remains of such as she was.' Then I spoke angrily, and bade them hold their tongues, and not judge a woman who was better than themselves. Then others came, and said they remembered the day, twenty years and more ago, when she had been converted; and that grace was never lost, and that such would be saved in spite of works, and that she was 'gone to glory.' Then I would be more angry still, and yet laugh at them, and say that if 'glory'

was to be earned so cheap, it was not worth having ; and so sent them away. And then the old woman was buried" (pp. 5, 6).

Joe Baker now obtains the consent of his old master, whose business is wholly managed by him, that he should bring home a wife to help him and keep the house ; and we are introduced to an excellent Catholic servant, called Fanny Cowper, to whom Joe proposes. The scene is exceedingly well described ; and though it ends in Fanny's refusing his offer, because she will never unite herself to any one but a Catholic, yet they part good friends, and he hears for the first time in his life a brief exposition of Catholic truth. Half in vexation, he marries a poor ill-educated girl, who has hitherto been remarkable in the village only for her love of tawdry finery, but who becomes really attached to her husband, and grows into a devoted wife. With the birth of their first child the real interest of the story begins. Fanny Cowper goes to see it, among other friends ; and her congratulations assume an earnest tone, while she says, "Take care of it, Baker ; take care of this dear creature ; remember it has an immortal—an immortal, a redeemed soul ; take care of that for which Jesus Christ died." The artist has done well to seize upon this incident as the subject of his drawing for the frontispiece, for it becomes quite the turning-point of the narrative. Fanny's words take possession of our hero's heart, and he continues to repeat them whenever he sees his child.

About this time, a young High-church clergyman, of model orthodoxy, succeeds to the cure of souls in the village. Perhaps the cleverest scene in the book is a keen and animated dispute which takes place in Baker's house, between Mr. Knight, for that was the clergyman's name, and a humble traveller named Fairfield, who, in the course of conversation, turns out to be a Catholic. The "One Church" is the subject of their debate : for its details we must refer our readers to the book itself ; it is terse and pointed in an admirable degree, and in few words shews up the anomalies and inconsistencies of Anglican claims to unity ; in language, too, which the simplest may comprehend. A sentence or two, on the use of private judgment, are too good to be omitted.

" ' I know, sir,' answered the man, ' that this person'—and he laid his hand on Baker's shoulder—' that this person is a Protestant ; and I look upon him as one in search of a religion, as one who seeks. Now all who seek must use their judgment. They go on looking, hearing, reading, and asking, Is *this* true ? is *this* ? But when a man *has found*, he seeks no more ; all questioning is given up ; judgment ceases, and faith begins. The Catholic has found the one



Church; he has faith. She teaches him; he knows it to be the voice of God; he bows down his whole self, and says, 'Speak, Lord, for thy servant heareth.' He remains like a little child, obedient, loving, full of faith and gratitude, and joy and hope. As a child rests upon a mother's breast, he rests on Holy Church; and that Mother of all God's children guides his steps, and for ever points upwards to Jesus on the cross, from whom come grace and salvation. This, sir, is why a Catholic has done with private judgment; all judgment is swallowed up in faith' " (p. 29).

John Fairfield had married Fanny Cowper, and settled on a little farm; and a young family began, in the course of years, to grow up about him. Baker's first and only child was passing from infancy into girlhood. His occasional perception of the truth and consistency of the Catholic Church, in her claims to unity and authority, had been gradually disposing him to desire to know more of her, and at some indefinite period even to submit to that authority and find peace. But the world was yet too strong for him, as it has proved for many; he must first secure a competency in his business; when a fixed sum has been saved, and invested for his old age and the settlement of his children, then he will set to work in earnest, and get this serious concern of his soul attended to. Meanwhile it will be the ruin of his business if he is even suspected of a leaning to that side; he is prudent therefore, and follows Mr. Knight's advice about Catholic books and Catholic matters in general.

Chapter sixth is a stirring one; containing a visit paid by Baker to the Fairfields, and his finding, on his arrival, their house in flames, John himself crippled by an accident, and one of the youngest children on the point of perishing in the fire. The rescue is described with breathless interest; the patient submission of the ruined family to their reverse of fortune is not more complete than may often be seen resulting from the grace of God; Baker is confirmed in his opinion of the good effects produced by the influence of Catholicity, but procrastinates. His child had gone to visit London, with a family of superior class which had taken a fancy to her; one day he is summoned to follow, if he would see her alive. She has been laid low by a sudden illness, and before he reaches her she expires. His agony of mind may be conceived, especially with his stifled convictions of the truth of the Catholic faith; he trembles for the soul of his child. But Providence has been kinder to her than her own father; in London she had accidentally found the Fairfields, who, as her father's friends, were very kind to her; in their humble house she saw and heard much of Catholicity; and in her illness she

had been taken into the Church, and had died fortified with the holy Sacraments. Her father adores the mercy and justice of God, and the work of his own conversion is begun in earnest.

A very amusing instance of Protestant prejudice, a sample of a thousand such which meet us every where, and the subjection of the "orthodox" Mr. Knight to the obedience of faith, are among the later incidents of importance in the story.

*Joe Baker*, like *James Jordan*, is addressed especially to the yeomanry and the middle classes of England; its modes of thought, its phrases and turns of expression, are theirs; its straightforward reasoning, its honest conclusions, are those which are happily familiar to their minds. They are a class for whom but little has yet been done, but little to dissipate their prejudices, and teach them what Catholicity really is. We do not know that there is in the English language a better persuasive to examination and candid search into the truth of the Catholic Church, addressed to our Saxon-English tradesman or farmer, than these little volumes. They tell their story; they plead; they dissect popular fallacies with a skilful hand; they are genial and glowing, with the homely charm of English rural scenery, with a message of peace for the honest and truthful English heart.

But even so, as it seems to us, the beneficent mission of *Joe Baker* is only half fulfilled. He appeals not only to the religious instinct, and the love of truth and consistency which remarkably distinguish the middle classes in England; his appeal may well reach the hearts of English Catholics also, reminding them of what perhaps they may know indeed already, but to which custom and other engagements may have rendered them less sensitive; we mean, the spiritual destitution of hundreds and thousands of Christ's perishing little ones in this land. The researches of philanthropy, the records of crime, present an appalling picture of the condition of the children of our poor, especially of that numerous class whose crimes have reduced them to the condition of outcasts and enemies of society. Children there are by hundreds, in our large cities, who, before they reach maturity, have exhausted the catalogue of crimes; young in years, old in vice; without God and without hope. Though outwardly less dreadful, the condition of the children of our rural population is hardly less distressing to the observation of Christian charity. They are educated, perhaps, in the rudiments of human knowledge; but they are left in ignorance of the beauty and sweetness of religion, so peculiarly adapted to the instincts and yearnings of

young hearts. The cold formalities of Anglican worship find no response in them; the only chance of obtaining something like sympathy is in the hot fanaticism of Dissent. Strange to them, as the occurrences and habits of another world, are the hallowed light of Catholic altars; the sweet music of litanies, and the worship of the Most Holy on his high throne at benediction; the gentle winning power of the divine word in the formation and correction of the conscience in the confessional; the rapture and the foretaste of heaven on a day of first communion. From all such fair and beautiful things a great gulf separates the poor children of our once Catholic England; they must prepare as they can without them for the struggle of life, for the moment of death. Few can read the description of such an unblest death in *Joe Baker* without tears.

“Then came Jem and Mary; they had both died the last winter of ‘the fever.’ I am sure that it would have been better for them if their living souls had had as many thoughts as were given to their cold corpses. We sent them food in their illness; Ellen was there often, and she hired a nurse to help her mother. But there lay the poor, ignorant, worn-out creatures, dying, dying in spite of the doctors and every body else. It would be nonsense to talk of these young things having any knowledge of religion; they had none. While they lay in their mortal illness, a Ranting preacher and a Methodist woman came. Jem could not bear the sight of them; and clasping his aching head and throbbing temples, muttered curses as they preached or prayed. The girl was so frightened that she became delirious; and so those poor creatures—those souls for whom Christ died—passed out of life and went to judgment. And I must believe that when the just Judge of all mankind passed sentence on their souls, he looked back to the cause of their miserable ignorance, and dealt gently with them. As I looked at their dead bodies, I repeated the words, ‘I believe in one, holy, catholic, and apostolic Church.’ I stopped there, and then said to myself, ‘I am sure I wish that I *could* believe those words; I wish that I *could* find the thing they describe. John Fairfield called that Church his mother. Mother! a spiritual mother, given by our God and Saviour to do a mother’s part to our souls. What is a mother’s part? To nourish, cherish, guide; to shield from all danger, guide to all good; to support in trouble, and through all to teach salvation. Surely if these children had known such a mother, Jesus would not have died upon the cross in vain for them. In vain!’ I cried; ‘oh, *not* in vain; they are not lost; they were never taught. O God, be merciful’ ” (pp. 36, 37).

Shall it be so always? Shall it always be that the bright-eyed, sunny-haired children of our Saxon race must remain strangers to the tenderness of a spiritual mother, in ignorance



of their holy Mother Mary? Those Catholics whom Providence has endowed with the goods of this world, with influence, with dependants, would do well to ask their consciences what they are doing, what efforts or sacrifices they are making, to diminish, if they cannot hope to remove, this calamity. We know of many who are doing something in their neighbourhood; we know of a few who are spending themselves, as well as their substance, in preaching the glad tidings of that Mother's love to the little heathens of their own district. The success of their labours is no small reward of their piety and zeal for souls. Their message of mercy falls into the souls of those neglected little ones like gentle rain into the parched earth; faith, and hope, and love, spring up from a fruitful soil; and in some parts of England there is a generation of Catholic peasantry once more arising to rejoice the old saints of this land. The harvest truly is abundant, but the labourers are few; the heart sinks at the thought of what is to be done; of the thousands of children even now perishing for want of knowledge, within sight of our churches, within reach of our exertions, and no man careth for their souls. We thank the author of *Joe Baker* for ourselves, and in the name of those miserable objects of Christian charity, for this earnest appeal in their behalf; and we trust that it will not be without its results in stimulating our Catholic body generally to larger sacrifices, to wider benevolence, in the cause of poor English children. We would fain hope also, that, somewhere or other throughout this land, the perusal of *Joe Baker*, and reflection on the destitution of the means of grace there described, may kindle in some generous hearts the desire to give up all things for the sake of Christ's little ones; may incline them to do all that lies in their power to assist those blessed orders in holy religion, whose mission it is to love, and tend, and instruct them; may dispose others to whom "it is given," to qualify themselves as missionaries of the Catholic faith among the neglected objects of Christ's Passion. If one such dedication should be the fruit of *Joe Baker's* appeal, the ability and earnest regard for souls, and true Christian philanthropy which are characteristic of its excellence, will not be inadequately rewarded.

---

## SHORT NOTICES.

WE have received some additional numbers of the splendid edition of *Haydock's Catholic Family Bible and Commentary*, published by Messrs. Dunigan, New York (London, Dolman). Eleven numbers are now out, and the work is to be completed in thirty-eight. It is, without exception, one of the handsomest and cheapest editions of the Bible we have ever seen.

*The Life of Mrs. Eliza A. Seton*, Foundress and first Superioress of the Sisters or Daughters of Charity in America, by the Rev. C. J. White, D.D. (Dunigan, New York; London, Dolman), is not only a most important contribution to American Catholic literature, but a very interesting work to all Catholics everywhere. It is seldom that one has an opportunity of studying so much in detail the progress of the work of grace in a soul that is being brought out of Protestantism into the one true fold. Mrs. Seton's habit of keeping a journal, and her very voluminous correspondence, have supplied her biographer with more abundant, as well as more interesting and more authentic materials for his work than usually fall to the lot of labourers in this portion of the field of literature. Some readers, perhaps, will be disposed to consider that the materials in this instance have been almost too abundant, or at least will wish that Dr. White had been more sparing in his use of them. Considering, however, the immense importance of the work which Mrs. Seton wrought for the Church in the United States, we cannot subscribe to this criticism. Neither can we regret the length or number of the extracts which Dr. White has given both from the letters, the diary, and the private devotions of his heroine during the many years that she was a Protestant, especially since we suspect that they are of a very different character from what many Catholics would have anticipated. Mrs. Seton was the second daughter of an eminent physician in New York, and was born in 1774, two years before the declaration of American independence. Her mother was the daughter of an Episcopalian clergyman, and she herself was brought up a member of that communion. She was remarkable, even in her youth, for the interest which she took in all religious matters, and the zeal with which she discharged her religious duties; not, however, altogether according to the most approved forms of Episcopalianism: for we are told that she used to wear a small crucifix about her person, and expressed her surprise that such a practice should not be more common among her co-religionists; and she regretted also that there were no "Protestant nunneries." Moreover, she used to "sigh of a Sunday evening, and say, 'No more until next Sunday,' as she turned from the church-door which closed on her, *unless a prayer-day was given out in the week*;" and on "Sacrament-Sundays" she used to run from one church to another, that she might receive as often as she could! It was not to be expected that dispositions such as these should long be satisfied with the miserable empty husks that are to be found in Protestantism; and the merciful providence of God so disposed the order of events, that her marriage (at the age of 20) with an American merchant,—who had received a part of his mercantile education in a house at Leghorn, and who, after nine or ten years of married life (during which time Mrs. Seton became the mother of five children), was sent to Leghorn again for change of air,—should be the means of introducing her to those blessed gifts and

privileges which are the inheritance of the faithful. Her husband died almost immediately after their arrival in Italy; but his old friends the Filicchis, merchants, who were Catholics not in name only but in heart, and whose memory must ever be held in affectionate remembrance by the Sisters of Charity in America, were unremitting in their kindness towards the widow. In their company she visited some of the principal galleries and churches both in Florence and in Leghorn. Among the works of art, her attention seems to have been attracted only by those which treated of religious subjects; and in the churches, though she used diligently to repeat "her own service," as she calls it (meaning the Anglican form of daily prayer), yet she was sensibly struck by the numbers of "old men and old women, young women, and all sorts of people, kneeling promiscuously about the altar, so intent upon their prayers and rosary, that it is very immaterial what a stranger does." In entering a Catholic church she felt an impression of awe that she had never experienced in a Protestant place of worship; and on one occasion—in the celebrated sanctuary of our Blessed Lady at Monteno, near Leghorn—the profanity of a young Englishman who was present did much towards opening her eyes, and suggesting to her fruitful topics of meditation. This gentleman had selected the very moment of the elevation of the sacred Host as a fitting opportunity to scoff at "what they call their real presence."

A few days afterwards she re-embarked for America, scarcely having spent more than a month in Italy; but a storm, and damages done to the vessel by a collision, obliged her to return on shore the very next day. The day following, her child (the only one she had taken with her) proved to have the scarlet fever; and the captain could not, of course, receive her again on board to infect the other passengers. This detained them for three weeks in the Filicchi's house; then, as soon as the child recovered, the mother sickened with the same complaint and for the same period. During the whole of this time, "the patience and more than human kindness" of the Filicchis made a deep impression on Mrs. Seton. "You would say," she writes to a friend, "that it was our Saviour Himself they received in his poor and sick strangers." Nor was their kindness confined to a care for her bodily wants; they were still more zealous for the conversion of her soul; and being as intelligent in mind as they were edifying in conduct, and Mrs. S. having a most earnest desire to know and embrace the truth, she became thoroughly convinced, at the end of three months' sojourn in Leghorn, that Protestantism is a religion of man, and that only the Catholic faith comes from God. Unfortunately, however, according to a practice only too common in such cases, it was determined that God's call should not be obeyed without the consent and advice of friends. Mrs. S. was allowed to return to America without having been received into the Church, there to submit her determination to the judgment of people who could not possibly be expected to do otherwise than oppose it. Of course the usual consequences followed. Friends, relatives, acquaintances, ministers of the gospel, one and all set upon the unhappy lady with various instruments of suasion, threats and promises, arguments and denunciations; and if they did not succeed in convincing, at least they sufficed to create doubts and uncertainties, to disturb and make her very uneasy. Month after month passed away in this state; sometimes she could not make up her mind to go to any church at all; then to church, but not to (so-called) communion; and lastly, by a desperate effort, to communion also in one of the Protestant churches of New York. But this last was too much for her; she found she had not the least faith in any



thing the Protestant Church could give her, and she determined never to go there again. Still four months more of miserable uncertainty; and at last, just about a twelvemonth after her mind had first been made up, she submitted to Holy Church. For the history of her subsequent career, we must refer our readers to the volume itself: how she experienced the lot of *all* converts in the shape of neglect or persecution from the hands of her former friends and associates; how this cup of trial was sweetened by the consolations allowed to *some*, of seeing a few of her nearest and dearest relatives become partakers of the same happiness with herself; and the interesting course of events whereby she eventually became the foundress of an Institute of Charity, at first formed upon the model of that followed by the children of St. Vincent of Paul, and now actually incorporated with it, and which, beginning about forty years ago in Mrs. Seton and two other ladies, now numbers no less than 420 Sisters, and presides over 38 different establishments in the United States. We think we have said enough to interest our readers in the narrative, and to satisfy them that the volume in which it is contained (and which is very handsomely "got up,") will be a very welcome addition to any Catholic reading-room or library.

We do not precisely see what practical purpose is aimed at by the republication of the Rev. P. Green's *Letters on the Catholic Oath* (London, Jones, Richardson, &c.). It was well enough that the merits of that oath should be publicly and generally discussed while yet it was *in posse*; but, after twenty years' practical experience, we think it may safely be left to those whom it more immediately concerns; more especially since the author does not seem to have any thing new to say about it.

It is too late for us to recommend an abridgment of Father Segneri's *Devout Servant of Mary* (Manchester, Stutter; London, Dolman) for distribution among the poor during the month of May. It will be useful, however, at all times, as a cheap and simple manual for instructing those Catholics who have not access to larger works, in the truest and most acceptable means of serving their heavenly Mother.

We have always considered the Catholic Poor-School Committee the most important human institution that we have in England for the preservation and extension of the Catholic faith throughout the country. We are very glad, therefore, to learn from the *Fifth Annual Report* (London, sold by all Catholic booksellers), that its income during the year 1852 exceeded that of the preceding year by more than 500*l.*; though it must be acknowledged that it is far too small for the crying needs which it is called upon to supply. The present Report, however, is very encouraging, more especially as to the progress that has been made in that most important of all their undertakings, the establishment of a training-school for schoolmasters at St. Mary's, Hammersmith.

Mr. R. Raby has deserved the best thanks of all English Catholics for presenting us with the invaluable work of Blessed Henry Suso, *The Little Book of Eternal Wisdom*, in English (Richardson and Son). The work itself we could not presume to eulogise; "it speaks," as the translator justly says, "too eloquently for itself." We venture to anticipate that, when once known, this little work will be the inseparable companion of many an inmate of our religious houses, as well as of the devout in every state. Mr. Raby appears to have succeeded in his difficult task wonderfully well, on the whole; the spirit of the original is far better preserved by him in our cognate language than in the existing French and Italian translations, which indeed convey no idea of the work,

either as it is in the original German or in Susius's admirable Latin translation. It would be invidious to call attention to defects in a translation which we welcome so heartily; otherwise it would not have been difficult, perhaps, to point out some passages that are left needlessly obscure, and others that do not appear to us quite to convey the sense of the author as we have been used to understand him. Certain expressions also that can hardly be called genuine English, as the frequently recurring *Oh woe!* instead of *Alas!* as the translation of *Oh weh!* Before giving the explanation of the word *venia* in the preface, after the German editor, Mr. Raby would have done well to consult some one of the Order to which Blessed Henry Suso belonged; from whom he would have learnt that the *venia* is a manner of prostration quite as much in use with the Dominicans of the present day as with those of the middle ages; and that it does not consist in kneeling and kissing the ground, but in prostrating at full-length on the right side. We sincerely hope that the reception of this Book of Eternal Wisdom will be such as to induce Mr. Raby to fulfil his promise of giving to the public a translation of the very beautiful and touching life of its author.

---

## Correspondence.

### INSPECTION OF CONVENTS.

*To the Editor of the Rambler.*

SIR,—In drawing the attention of your readers to a Bill now before Parliament which has for its object the inspection and visitation of convents, I may possibly be thought somewhat premature, as the measure is still in its earliest stage, and the details are but imperfectly known. There are cases, however, in which we are permitted to repel even the first proposal of a violation of rights; and that promptly, and without much parley concerning details. Thus, were it understood that leave had been granted to bring in a Bill for the visitation of every Englishman's private home, by commissioners who should have the power to examine his wife and children as to his private treatment of them, to regulate his expenses, and to put down all family abuses, I think we should none of us stand much on the forms of the House, or consider ourselves bound to wait for the second reading, before we ventured to make our indignation known. Nay, were the proposed measure of a less inquisitorial nature, and, with only an over-zeal in the cause of public morality, to propose means for reducing our gin-palaces and public-houses, or the utter abolition of "penny gaffs" and other places of theatrical amusement, we can imagine how quickly the storm of popular resentment would be raised. What a cry from the vested interests of the maltsters and distillers! what a flutter of public sympathy for the *danseuse* and genteel comedian, in their banishment from the green-room of the Opera and Olympic! How speedily would they be raised to that dignity of suffering and oppressed patriotism which we have seen successively filled by Kossuth, Achilli, and the Madias! Surely every Catholic must see in the measure we have alluded to, an infraction of rights at least as sacred as these; and an impetuosity of indignation which would certainly be pardoned in their case may, we trust, be as readily excused in ours.

Hitherto the very notion of any kind of inquisitorial power has had in it something so repugnant to English feeling, that it has been sufficient for such a character to attach, though but in the remotest degree, to any measure, to render it unpopular amongst us. The Income Tax owes the opposition it annually meets with less to our indisposition to part with our money, than to an instinctive feeling that it is a grievance for any State-officer to be able to enter our houses and ask us questions. There is not a doubt that the passport system, so universally submitted to in other countries, would not be tolerated for a moment in our own. We are ready to pay any money which is demanded, but we cannot bear the tyranny of answering questions concerning our trade and the colour of our hair. If this be so, one would think it could only be some great and crying evil which could induce any member of the Legislature to propose a measure of this proverbially odious character. Great and crying evils are, unhappily, not unknown in England. Amid the swarming population of our town and factory districts, where crime and ignorance have ripened into alarming luxuriance, we can imagine many cases where the most liberal Legislature might feel it necessary to depart from the usual course, and to adopt measures a little at variance with the forms of a constitutional government. It would not be unnatural if some of those accidental revelations of the corruption lying under the polished surface of English society, which are given us at intervals, were to startle us into an unwilling severity. Some Blue-book or Parliamentary return, whose facts were too bad to be disregarded; some narrative, like Mr. Mayhew's, of what a man has seen with his own eyes and heard with his own ears,—might set us about the Augean task of cleansing out, and visiting, and suppressing some of those haunts of infamy and heathenism, where living souls have hitherto been suffered to sink to the lowest depth of degradation undisturbed, because we are accustomed to believe that the permission of licentiousness is a less evil than any arbitrary interference with private rights.

And such a moment has, it would seem, come at last. At last the English Parliament has found time to be moral. At last, relieved from those interminable discussions on the price of corn and of sugar, English legislators are beginning to turn their attention to the social abuses of their country. And we feel curious to imagine how it will read in future histories of this age, that at a time when one-half of the English population was unbaptised, and ignorant of the being of a God; when vice of all kinds had assumed so unblushing a form, that you might read in one of its gravest public journals of *schools* where thieving and lying were taught like other sciences, at so much a head; at a time when two counties have gained the enviable title of the "poisoning counties," on account of the number of secret murders committed in them; when, in many a mine and colliery, and dark neglected alley of our great towns, human beings live and die, and sin, and neither the world nor the law takes cognisance of their crimes or their existence,—at *such* a time, Parliament, roused at last to the necessity of Christian legislation, selects for the first object of its newly-found and virtuous indignation—the Catholic convents. The State, like a wise physician, stands over the fainting form of its leprosy-struck child. No wonder there is a talk of cautery and amputation: for one-half of the body is already mortified. But—incomprehensible wonder!—it is not to the blackened limbs, the open wounds which terrify us only to look at, that the first glance of the physician is directed; it is to that hand which the disease has not yet reached. It is to search carefully if by chance there should happen to be there some possible pin-scratch, because we are gravely told, though such things are rare, yet cases have been known, in other coun-



tries, where pin-scratches have festered, and spread up the arm, and into the body and the heart, and so people have died of them. What can we conclude from such conduct as this, than either that the physician has no real care for the life of his patient, or else that he has simply lost his senses?

I believe the ostensible object of the present inquiry is to satisfy men's minds whether or no the inmates of convents are there by their own consent or not. So utterly incomprehensible does it seem to Protestant intelligences that young ladies can be found who prefer a life of prayer and work for God to one of worldly dissipation, or even of domestic enjoyment, that nothing short of the assurance from their own lips to that effect can satisfy them. But surely a moment's reflection might suggest to these very curious inquirers, that if it is the Queen's duty to appoint a commission for ascertaining if every one fills his state of life voluntarily or not, she might have little else to do. There are other states, besides that of religion, to which men and women are bound for life; which they enter when, perhaps (as our opponents argue in the present case), they are too young to judge for themselves,—over-persuaded by parents, or for mercenary motives, whose burden they would be glad enough to escape from, but in which they are held captive, not by bars or bolts, but—singular analogy!—by the invisible power of their own plighted vows. There is no noviceship in marriage; no year in which a woman may try her own heart and those of others, and test her resolution and power of endurance, and know a little of the reality of things, before she takes that irrevocable vow. The world is less merciful than God. Those who choose their lot in the world's service must do it with small preparation; and if repentance come too late, they must make the best of it. It is not so with the service of God. We can excuse Protestants for knowing nothing concerning the patient and searching trial which is undergone by an aspirant to the religious life, before she is *permitted* to take those vows which it is the fashion to suppose are so often forced on her against her will. But we cannot excuse them if, with so plain a parallel before their eyes, they advocate, as just and necessary in *one* case, an impertinent intrusion, which they would stigmatise in the other as an unheard-of and wanton outrage. Yet, after all, where is the difference? Perhaps to the mover and seconder of this measure it may be a new thought that this inspection of convents may in some future day be made a ground for obtaining an inspection of their own private homes. This principle of "inspection" once sanctioned by the Legislature, if any honourable gentleman should feel a curiosity to know if "the wives of England" are willing inmates or enforced captives in their husbands' homes, his course lies straight before him. Let him move for a "commission;" only he must not be much surprised, should those on whose domestic quiet the "commission" intrudes take the summary measure of kicking it downstairs.

But this is indeed a most absurd supposition. The courage of these gentlemen will always be tempered with discretion. We may confidently affirm that they will confine themselves to the safe "inspection" of those retreats where there is nothing to be feared from husbands and brothers; where the weakness of their victims gives all limits to their powers of annoyance; where they will find none but those whose only protection, since they gave themselves to God, has been the vow which they vainly hoped was to separate them from the world for ever.

I would beg you also to observe a phrase very constantly used in late discussions on this subject. It is the fashion to speak of religious houses as "institutions," and their inhabitants as "inmates;" terms of course perfectly innocent, but calculated to put them exactly on a par

with workhouses, hospitals, prisons, and similar places into which the public can enter whenever it likes, and make a display of intelligence by putting sharp questions concerning the food and the treatment of their inmates. In fact, there is a cheap benevolence,—something, we should rather say, half-way between benevolence and inquisitiveness,—which likes to do this sort of thing, to go over public “institutions,” to whose support perhaps it contributes not a shilling, and be very particular as to the quantity of barley in the prisoners’ soup, and the number of blankets on their beds. This is the position in which it is now desired that the religious retreats of Catholic ladies should be placed. True, the present proposal goes no farther than to inquire concerning their “personal liberty.” But, sir, once admit these gentlemen within the sacred enclosure, how shall we set limits to their benevolence or their curiosity? It may be necessary for them to have ocular demonstration that besides the “inmates” brought before them for examination, there are none concealed in secret garrets, and there tortured with thumb-screw and rack. Or, they may think it their duty to rule the diet as well as the other discipline of the house; and the forty days of abstinence, and fast-days of obligation, may well seem unchristian living to those who “fare sumptuously every day.” Or, (who knows?) they may fancy some change in the conventual dress. The religious costume has not been much in favour with the English legislature of late; and it would not be extravagant to anticipate the time when the veil and kerchief shall give place to the mob-cap of the London charity-school, as regards women; and for men, if the provisions of the bill extend to them, we may perhaps see the Franciscan cord and time-honoured scapular of St. Dominic abolished for the yellow stockings and etcetera of Christ’s Hospital—that only representative of a community-dress, which, as finding favour in the eyes of the fathers of the British Reformation, has been invented or retained in the Protestant “institutions” of England. I feel, sir, I am transgressing the limits which I am bound to observe, and perhaps I am speaking more lightly than my subject deserves. There is, however, one observation of a different character, to which I desire to draw your attention. Any one who is in the habit of looking at the life around him with a thoughtful eye, may perceive two marks on the society of our own day, both of which affect the destiny and position of women. In the upper and educated classes there is a rapid and extraordinary development in their intellectual and mental powers. They are no longer the illiterate and thoughtless playthings of past centuries. Gold, long ago, taught them to feel; we have lately been teaching them to think. But these powers, combined together, have created in them many new wants. We see every where amongst them the signs of an awakened energy, which, as yet, has not found the object on which to work. This too at a time when, from various social causes, the number of those who find their calling and their contentment in the duties of domestic life is comparatively small. There is, as it were, amongst women of our day, a new suffering, quite unknown before—the suffering of unemployed power; and it is worth remarking, that the most striking manifestations of this singular truth are to be found in the works of the female writers of the three Protestant countries—England, Germany, and America, where of course the resource offered by convents is rarest. From each of these I could select witnesses whose truthfulness of painting would readily be acknowledged, and who have depicted in most startling colours the unknown mental anguish of those whose minds are growing too large for a little life. This on one side; on the other, amongst the lower classes an excess of sin and ignorance which is crying for work,—work, too, which perhaps



only women can do, certainly which none can do so well. Children to be taught, the hungry to be fed, the penitent to be reclaimed. There is, as it were, the demand and the supply for both of these social evils. The religious life, in all its varied forms, brings these two extremes in contact one with another: to the educated woman who has become weary of her life without an object, it gives an object vast enough to live for; whilst to the wants of the people it offers a remedy which no act of parliament, or national society, or paid official can ever give, that "unbought love" of which a great orator of our own day speaks so eloquently,—which in weakness works miracles that the wisdom of the world is powerless to work; which brings to the hospital, the school, or even to the abode of sin, a "representative of Jesus Christ," because it brings one who is the servant of all, and the price of whose services is but the constraining love of Him who is her plighted spouse.

I would willingly conclude these remarks, sir, with one word of consolation to those who are to be the victims of this iniquitous measure. It offers them the only testimony which the powers of evil can ever offer to the power of good,—the testimony of *fear*. All this foaming and gnashing of teeth, and casting into fire and water, is but the rage of the devils who recognise the power which is about to cast them out. The world can endure the Church well enough when that Church is nothing more than the English establishment, which lets men's consciences alone, and never intrudes where it is not wanted. But a different power is now walking through the length and breadth of England, one often made most manifest in the weakness of women; and before this power, whose duty they know it is to exorcise them, the evil spirits tremble. Hating the name of Christ, it is but natural they should hate His spouses; and as they seek, in their petty malignity, to deal a blow at Him, they do wisely in aiming their deadliest thrust there where the heart of Jesus is likeliest to be found. Happily it is not in pages such as these that those we speak of will seek for consolation: not here, nor in any testimony of human respect or sympathy. Not in the tongues of men or of angels, but in the words of Him whom only they care for in heaven or in earth: "The servant is not greater than his Lord; if they have hated me, they will hate you also. Blessed are ye, when they shall revile you, and persecute you, and speak all that is evil against you untruly for my sake. Be glad and rejoice, for your reward is very great in heaven."

Faithfully yours,

T. C.

---

#### ALL HALLOWS COLLEGE, DRUMCONDRA, DUBLIN.

*To the Editor of the Rambler.*

SIR,—At a time when so many things combine to invite my fellow-countrymen to visit Ireland, when the Great Exhibition, so auspiciously inaugurated last week, is drawing its crowds to Dublin, and the just completed railway is carrying them on to the wild and romantic scenery of Killarney, I hope that those of your readers who intend to avail themselves of this combined attraction will not be unwilling to hear something of a place which has special claims upon their attention, which it will not take them out of their way to visit, but which, if not thus brought before them, might escape their notice. Nor let those who cannot come among us suppose that that they have no concern in what I am going to write, because I am sure that no good Catholic can be indifferent to the history of a work so fraught with interest as the



College which trains the greater portion of those who are sent forth on the foreign missions by the Catholic Church in Ireland.

About ten years ago a humble and zealous priest in Dublin was moved by the sight of so many of his poor fellow-countrymen leaving their Catholic homes for a land in which the means of grace were as scanty as those of this world were plentiful, and undertook the arduous task of establishing a college for the training of Foreign Missionaries. He had no rich friends to assist him, no commanding abilities to bring to this work; but he had what was far better and more needful, an unhesitating faith and an untiring zeal. So, with the cordial assent of his Archbishop, he started for Rome, and cast himself and his cause at the feet of Christ's Vicar, Gregory XVI.; the Holy Father approved of the work, and commended it to the support of the faithful. Strong in this encouragement, the zealous priest solicited, with fair success, the alms of the Faithful in Rome and at Paris; and returning to Dublin, he completed the collection of sufficient funds wherewith to begin his college. Sufficient, I mean, in the eyes of one who worked in faith; enough to hire a house and make a beginning with, but very insufficient the whole amount would seem to those who fear to do anything before they can do all. He joined with himself three other priests, and began the college with *one* student! This was in 1842; and now in ten years the staff of directors has increased to ten, and that of students to near ninety; while the college can boast of having sent forth missionaries into each quarter of the globe to the number of *one hundred and thirty*.

The founder, Father Hand, now rests in peace: his body lies in the little cemetery attached to the college. He lived but a few years after the work was begun, but long enough to impart his spirit to the place, and long enough to observe the seed he sowed so carefully and in such generous faith, spring up and bear fruit abundantly. And so the good work has gone on. Year after year young missionary priests have been sent forth to every new settlement whither their Catholic fellow-subjects have gone before them, while the number of candidates for admission into the college has not only filled the places thus vacated, but has driven the directors to every possible contrivance to accommodate them. The fine old mansion was filled to overflowing, then the very stables were brought into requisition, then new buildings arose; but all will not suffice; the stream still flows in with augmented force, and so nothing else will do but we must build upon a large scale, for which the necessary drawings are being now made; and then the outward form will accord better with the inward spirit, and Holy Church will raise another trophy to her triumph in this our day over the false creed which has usurped her property, her name and place in the land. But already is there one feature which marks the religious destination of the place, and distinguishes it from the country seats which surround it, and that is its fine Gothic chapel, designed in true Catholic spirit by M'Carthy, one of Ireland's best architects, and a worthy disciple of the great Pugin. At present this stands alone, but soon we hope it will occupy its due place in a noble cluster of collegiate buildings.

The visitor must not come, however, with thoughts of our Cambridge and Oxford colleges in his mind: we cannot look to rival those glorious works of our Catholic forefathers, at least in outward beauty and majesty; but if, with wiser scrutiny, he inquires into the discipline and rule of our house, he will find that which Protestantism has driven out of our ancient homes, that without which college-life ceases to be any thing better than literary leisure or refined idleness.

There are no salaried officers. President and directors alike "having food and raiment" have learned to "be therewith content." And

thus all the funds are spent upon the college itself. The students pay each a half-pension of 10*l.* annually, and the foreign Bishops pay the other half for the students destined for their missions. Of course the sum thus raised is not sufficient to support so large an establishment, containing as it does upwards of 110 persons: hence the need of annual subscriptions, donations and legacies, without which the good work must come to an end; but these, thank God! have not been wanting: *poor* Ireland has done in this, as in so many other instances, what the Christian poor invariably do, it has given generously, unstintingly, and beyond its power. I could tell of instances, neither rare nor much regarded,—for in this truly Catholic country heroic charity shews itself almost as a rule,—in which the careful savings of years among the poorer classes have been brought to the college, and given to its funds in a quiet matter-of-course way, as though it were no great thing to do; and with an expression of joy at God's mercy in accepting the offering. Again, I could relate, were it right to do so, what I cannot think of without thankfulness and pleasure, the hard toil and years of self-instruction and self-denial which have in many cases preceded the entrance of students into the college, by which they have raised sufficient means to pay their small pensions; and I could tell of the sacrifice of their little comforts—in some cases of the very necessities of life—which parents and kindred have made to enable a son or a brother to follow his vocation, and to go through the course of study which prepares him, by God's grace, for the life-long toil of the foreign mission.

It is indeed a high privilege to share in such a work; and those who can aid us with money will rejoice eternally in having done a good work, which must have its fruit now and hereafter. By a rule of the College, any one by paying annually 10*l.* obtains the right of sending a student into the house, or else he may affiliate a student already there to any particular mission.

I need not stay to speak of the importance of supplying these foreign missions with zealous workmen; the people they minister among are our fellow-countrymen, or fellow-subjects, whom an honest zeal for the welfare of their families (sometimes, alas, I fear a miserable and bigoted persecution at home) has driven into other lands. New temptations beset them where means of grace are most wanting. Alas, how many fall a prey to Satan's snare, infidel Mormonists, or Protestants of some other denomination. And when God's mercy raises up men fit and willing to do the work of preserving and guiding these poor emigrants, shall we withhold the means which will enable them to enter upon their labour of love? Rather let us meet sacrifice by sacrifice, and thereby help forward God's cause, and bless Him for permitting us in any measure to do so.

I am in a position to write unhesitatingly and frankly on this subject; for my connection with the College is too recent to give me a claim to any share in its merits, while it is long enough to enable me to speak with confidence of the system, whose working I have watched closely. It is a system in which no self-indulgence is endured, and from which men go forth and do the Lord's work to the salvation of souls, and are a comfort and blessing to the Bishops under whom they labour, as several of the Missionary Bishops have themselves assured me.

I remain, Sir, &c. HENRY BEDFORD, M.A.

*All Hallows College, May 19, 1853.*

*Cantab.*

END OF VOL. XI.

Robson, Levey, and Franklyn, Grea New Street, Fetter Lane.

